

Modern Language Notes

Volume LI

APRIL, 1936

Number 4

THE REVIEWERS AND THE NEW TRENDS IN POETRY, 1754-1770

In a companion article which examined the reviews of the leading critical works from 1754 to 1770,¹ I attempted to show that, so far from being startling or revolutionary, the "romantic" ideas of these works generally seemed either commonplace or sufficiently consistent with the reviewers' own notions and tastes as to be immediately acceptable; in several cases the critical heresies appeared to be trite or old-fashioned to a reviewer who had already become aware of the inconsistencies and insufficiencies of the common Augustan standards of criticism; the few reviews which still tried to maintain strictly the old critical dogmas were apologetic in tone or equivocal in substance, frequently using old terms for new concepts or fitting old concepts to new terms. Liberal views had been expressed by critics throughout the Augustan period, interspersed among orthodox beliefs, but in the period discussed critics began to adapt them to contemporaneous works, both obscure and distinguished, and they grew conscious that many productions accepted by their predecessors would fare badly when tested by the new criteria for true poetry. In the present article I shall comment on developments of literary theory in the reviews of several poetical compositions which were connected with the "romantic" trend, showing how the fresh currents in poetry affected critics and to what extent liberal principles of criticism are exemplified in the reviews.²

¹ "The Reviewers and the New Criticism, 1754-1770," *PQ.*, XIII (1934), 189-202. For a fuller discussion of the developments in literary theory see my article, "The Discussion of Taste, from 1750 to 1770, and the New Trends in Literary Criticism," *PMLA.*, XLIX (1934), 577-92.

² I have selected fourteen poetical works which appear to me among the

The concept of the poet as a bard and an original genius had broadened the early eighteenth-century idea of the essence of poetry, emphasizing the need of warmth, animation, wildness, imagination, creative genius, boldness, and an appeal to the heart; and turning away the stress from reason and polish of form.³ In the ode-writer passion and irregularity had long been allowed, so it is not surprising to find Gray's *Odes* hailed for the qualities of fire and wildness, and even for enthusiasm, ecstasy, and prophetic fury.⁴ But the "romantic" qualities were admired in other sorts of verse as well. Beattie's *Original Poems and Translations* met with praise for exhibiting energy and imagination;⁵ and Macpherson's *Fragments of Ancient Poetry* won approval for being "animated with a wild, passionate and pathetic spirit of poetry," and for displaying "strokes of a fine imagination" and passages truly sublime.⁶ In Smart's *Song to David* one reviewer found great rapture and devotion, and decided that the poem "must at once please and affect a sensible mind."⁷ Another reviewer detected in it something altogether original, and described it as being not so much greatly irregular as irregularly great.⁸ The enthusiasm and wildness of *Fingal* appealed strongly to the *Critical Review*,⁹ and the *Annual Register* for 1761 liked in it "that native simplicity, that wild luxuriance, that romantic air." In Percy's *Five Pieces of Runic Poetry* one writer felt the lack of imagery and art, but he still was pleased with a portion for its boldness and rapidity of composition.¹⁰

Along with boldness, passion, and imagination, critics were beginning to demand originality of thought and creative power.

more significant of the period (though two of them are perhaps only tenuously connected with the "romantic" current), and have considered all genuinely critical reviews which notice them in the *Monthly Review*, *Critical Review*, *London Magazine*, and *Annual Register*.

³ The reviewers were generally from the first taste deeply impressed by the poetry of the Bards. The *Monthly's Review* (formerly attributed to Goldsmith) of Mallet's *Remains of the Mythology and Poetry of the Celts* discovered the Edda's account of the future destruction of the world to be "to the last degree, sublime and picturesque" (xvi [1757], 381).

⁴ *Critical*, iv (1757), 167, 169.

⁵ *Ibid.*, xi (1761, 302; *Monthly*, xxiv (1761), 393.

⁶ *Annual Register* for 1760, p. 254; *Critical*, x (1760), 28, 29.

⁷ *Critical*, xv (1763), 324.

⁸ xii (1761), 413; xiii (1762), 50.

⁹ *Monthly*, xxviii (1763), 320-21.

¹⁰ *Critical*, xv (1763), 309.

Mason's volume of odes was condemned on one hand for its lack of originality and its "obvious sterility of thought"; and on the other hand for its want of "true creative genius," which in odes is even more necessary than in any other performance.¹¹ Though the *Monthly* admired part of Gray's *Odes*, it still advised the poet that if he wanted to give greater pleasure and acquire greater fame, he must stop imitating and be more an original.¹² And in Smart's *Song to David* one of the features most admired was its conspicuous originality.

While critics were insisting on imagination, originality, boldness, and passion, they were engaged in disparaging verse characterized chiefly by correctness or polish. The *Critical* admitted that Mason's odes were pleasing to the ear, but asserted that they were not calculated to touch the heart.¹³ And the same author's volume of elegies was coolly received by the *Critical* because it exhibited merely "a cold correctness of expression"; and by the *Monthly* because on the whole it displayed art but lacked simplicity and originality.¹⁴ Regarding the book as a product of acquired taste rather than native genius, the *Monthly* dismissed Hamilton's *Poems on Several Occasions*; the *London Magazine*, though admitting it to be genteel and agreeable, evidently considered it of minor importance; and the *Critical*, while conceding the work to be pleasing and to exhibit an elegant taste, concluded that it lacked the sublime and the higher qualities of poetry.¹⁵ Home's *Douglas*, despite its happy descriptions, failed to impress the *Monthly* greatly because it lacked poetic fire and pathos.¹⁶

Since originality was demanded by critics, it was natural that works of translation should no longer receive the homage paid them in the seventeenth and early eighteenth century. Both the

¹¹ *Monthly*, XIV (1756), 435; *Critical*, I (1756), 209, 214.

¹² *XVII* (1757), 240.

¹³ I (1756), 212. Toward mere correctness, piety, and technical competence the general attitude of reviewers in this period is expressed by the comment upon Mason's *Odes Descriptive and Allegorical*: "Upon the whole, our author wants that wildness, glow, and heat of imagination, which constitutes the true poet, though he is every where superior to the common herd of ode-writers" (*Critical*, XI [1761], 158-9).

¹⁴ *Critical*, XIV (1762), 447; *Monthly*, XXVII (1762), 485-92.

¹⁵ *Monthly*, XXIV (1761), 162; *London Mag.*, XXX (1761), 56; *Critical*, XI (1761), 48.

¹⁶ *XVI* (1757), 428.

Critical and the *Monthly* spoke slightly of the translations and lauded the original verse in Beattie's volume of 1761.¹⁷ Moreover, didactic poetry, as it merely embellished commonplaces of morality, was likely to be frowned upon, and we find Mason's *Elegies* attacked for expressing only "a dull morality of sentiment," for being the work of a good man rather than of a "warm, animated, and enthusiastic poet."¹⁸

In the period herein discussed there is discernible the gradual development of an idea of progress¹⁹—an idea, it is true, which is likely to stress the non-bardic qualities of delicacy and refinement as the basis of modern superiority,²⁰ but which, since it opened the way for asserting the desirability of originality and for emphasizing a spirit and manner in the modern literature which was supposedly absent from the ancient, encouraged poets to strike out in new paths, after the manner of the bards.

Among the Augustan critics irregularities had sometimes been excused if they were accompanied by distinguished beauties, but after the mid-century it was no longer necessary to apologize for them. Smart's *Song to David* was praised though it was irregularly great. The *Monthly*'s conservative notice of Douglas restated a belief long current, that "A mechanically exact adherence to all the rules of the Drama, is more the business of industry than of genius."²¹ But reviewers generally had much less respect for the once-sacred rules, holding them to be a result of superstition or an actual cause of dullness.²² For example, the reviewer of *Fingal* in the *Monthly*, feeling the power of its loosely constructed figures, bold similes, and the romantic obscurity of

¹⁷ *Critical*, XI (1761), 304; *Monthly*, XXIV (1761), 393-5.

¹⁸ *Critical*, XIV (1762), 447-8.

¹⁹ For a few indications of this trend see "The Reviewers and the New Criticism," *PQ.*, XIII (1934), 197.

²⁰ The *Critical Review* (XII, 1761, 405-18, and XIII, 1762, 45-53) observed of *Fingal* that it was superior to Homer and Virgil in respect to its tenderness and humanity of feeling.

²¹ XVI (1757), 427.

²² The *Critical* in 1762 denounced the authors of modern English tragedy, who were "fond of imitating the dull regularity of the French drama" (XIII, 404). And in the 1755 volume of the *Monthly* a correspondent, noticing Voltaire's *Orphelin de la Chine*, protested against the authority of Aristotle in the drama; if we credited Aristotle, he sneered, we should have to believe that the sun moves around the earth (XIII, 494).

atmosphere, contended that precision and propriety are "enemies to the sublime" which check "the powers of genius, and cool the warmth of imagination."²³

Admiration of the bard such as we find in Blackwell had prepared the way for praising conditions in early society as favorable to the growth of great poetry. In reviewing *Fingal* the *Annual Register* for 1761 exclaimed enthusiastically about society and men in Fingal's day, "the wild sublimity of their virtues," their extravagant heroism, and "their superstitious notions so beautifully poetic." And the clearer perception of the diversity of life and manners in distant ages gave great impetus to the development of the historical viewpoint.

The historical viewpoint was one of the strongest forces leading to the downfall of the rules since it undermined the assumption of Aristotelian critics that all men were essentially the same, an assumption which made universal rules possible. In one review of *Fingal* it was pointed out that though the poem was admirable as an expression of an early society, yet, if it were found to be modern, there would be no extenuation of its faults.²⁴ And in noticing Gray's *Odes* the critic of the *Monthly* avowed a distaste for the ode-form, asserting that it was fashioned to please the warm and sensitive Greek spirit and was therefore unsuited to the English temper and to English music.²⁵ Realizing that classical rules could not be imposed on a creation of a different type of society and of a different age, the *Critical* reviewer said of *Fingal*: "It would be as absurd to examine this poem by the rules of Aristotle, as it would be to judge a Lapland jacket by the fashion of an Armenian gaberdine."²⁶

²³ xxvi (1762), 44.

²⁴ *Annual Register* for 1761, p. 282.

²⁵ xvii (1757), 239.

²⁶ xii (1761), 410. The historical viewpoint had been assumed by John Dennis in discussing the use of a chorus in tragedy and of the love-motif in the drama; and the idea that national differences must be taken into account in applying rules to a work of art was a commonplace, stated by Saint-Évremond and repeated by Rowe, Pope, Warton, and many others. The principle, however, was not commonly applied to specific works nor to specific literary problems until after the middle of the century. For a fuller discussion of the historical viewpoint, see the unpublished Johns Hopkins dissertation by Miss Frances Miller, *The Historic Sense in Eighteenth-Century English Literature*.

For other reasons also the rules were falling under attack. There was an inclination, strongly illustrated in Dr. Johnson, to submit poetry to a pragmatic test: it is good if it succeeds in pleasing. Dramatic critics were disposed to speak well of a play which delighted audiences. Discussing Home's *Douglas*, the *Critical* observed that sentiments natural to the characters and lines natural to the situation pleaded strongly with the audience in favor of the play; and the reviewer, although warning against the dangers of judging a play by its representation in the theater, appeared somewhat impressed by the audience's verdict.²⁷ The pragmatic view was well stated by the writer who noticed Ossian in the *Critical*: "Some critics, more attached to the form than to the spirit of poetry, have condemned Ariosto because he deviated from the established rules of the Stagyrte; and others have as strenuously asserted, that he had a right to invent a new species of composition. . . . Without all doubt, if the poetry is agreeable, the poet has a natural right to choose the manner in which it shall be presented."²⁸

One of the sturdy props of the Aristotelian rules was the idea that art should imitate only idealized nature, *la belle nature*, and not the variegated nature of realistic and vulgar experience. The Augustans approved of fidelity to nature but did not care for "low" nature, for dialect, or for rusticity or provincialism (except in comedy and pastoral); they believed that an artist must select his details so as to present the best possible picture of the subject. After the middle of the century, however, a description might be praised because it was accurate and realistic in its details. Reviewing Percy's *Reliques*, the *Critical* admired the habits of the ballad-muses, observing: "The manners not only of their ages, but the provinces where they lived, are delineated by the

²⁷ III (1757), 266.

²⁸ XII (1761), 410. This review is the more notable as it was presumably written before the publication of Hurd's *Letters on Chivalry*, famous for its defence of Ariosto and the romances. The tendency to accept that which succeeded in pleasing, without regard to form or regularity, received strong support from the current discussions of taste. It was generally agreed in these discussions that a standard of taste and guide for composition must be grounded, not on the old critical dogmas, but on a psychological study of the works which actually pleased the public and of the causes for their pleasing (see *PMLA.*, XLIX [1934], 577-92).

truest pencil, that of Nature; and however homely her strokes may sometimes be, the resemblance is always just, and therefore pleasing."²⁹ This defense of homely realism, and even of local color, is matched in the *Monthly's* review of *Douglas*, in which the critic finds the chief virtue of the play to lie in its happy description of "Those parts of Nature, and that rural simplicity, with which the Author was, perhaps, best acquainted."³⁰ That simple and humble characters in tragedy could be admired if only they were realistic, illustrates how the idea of a tragic poem had changed.

Certain of the new trends in poetry were received cordially, in part because the conception of classical art was being distinctly widened, partly by a closer study of Greek literature. The *Critical* applauded Gray's Norse poems as evidencing a vigorous imagination, with imagery strongly conceived and "abounding with those terrible graces of which Aristotle tells us Æschylus was so fully possessed."³¹ It is significant that the Gothic *diableries* can be compared with the classical graces. Even obscurity might be regarded as classical, and we find the *Critical* (iv, 167) remarking of the vague transitions in Gray's *Odes*: "... even this obscurity affords a kind of mysterious veil, which gives a venerable and classical air to the performance."

Of course, all reviews were not romantic in their trend. Many Augustan prejudices still survived. The *Monthly* disdained the Gothic air of Gray's Norse poems,³² as it had scorned the Gothic mysteries of the *Castle of Otranto*—and as it denounced the "gross improprieties and tautologies" of Macpherson's *Fragments*.³³ And though the *Critical* admired the boldness and wildness of *Fingal*, it still tried to reassure itself with the reflection that the poem might be proved an epic by the standards of Aristotle;³⁴ while the *Monthly* actually measured it by the rules for the epic and found it wanting.³⁵ Both the *Monthly* and *Critical* regretted the lack of

²⁹ XIX (1765), 119.

³⁰ XVI (1757), 428. For a discussion of the growing appreciation of realistic qualities in Shakespeare during this period, see David Lovett, "Shakespeare as a Poet of Realism in the 18th Century," *ELH*, II (1935), 267-289.

³¹ XXV (1768), 367.

³² XXXVIII (1768), 408.

³³ XXIII (1760), 205.

³⁴ XII (1761), 410.

³⁵ XXVI (1762), 41-57, 130-41.

art and imagery in Percy's *Five Pieces of Runic Poetry*;³⁶ and while the *Monthly* confessed that the compositions had some merit in themselves for their pleasing simplicity and artless graces, the "rude simplicity" and "antique roughness" of early poetry as represented in Percy's *Reliques* were not to the taste of the *Annual Register* for 1765.³⁷ Moreover, the bogus antiquity of Macpherson appealed to one reviewer much more than such older poetry as appeared in Percy's translation of *Northern Antiquities*.³⁸ Though the *Critical* detected signs of genius and the sublime in certain parts of Evan Evans's *Specimens of the Poetry of the Antient Welsh Bards*, yet it admired the work chiefly because of its freedom from low, vulgar, and unpoetic diction.³⁹ Also it styled *Douglas* a poor tragic poem inasmuch as the plot was faulty, poetic justice was violated, and the characters generally were not well supported.⁴⁰ These were types of criticism that might well have been voiced fifty years previously.

Nevertheless, the dominant trend of the reviews was liberal, or "romantic," and poetry was not likely to be received with much favor unless it exhibited imagination, enthusiasm, originality, strength, and passion (an appeal to the heart). More and more the test of verse was coming to be merely its ability to please. Those poems which were rejected, were commonly dismissed not because they were filled with irregularities or improprieties but because they were dull of imagination, unoriginal, or tame of spirit. "Romantic" principles of criticism were scarcely striking or revolutionary since they were being regularly applied in the popular reviews of poetry. Furthermore, the new poetry, harbinger of later romantic feeling, cannot accurately be said to have been in advance of public taste—at least in so far as public taste is reflected in the reviews. The way was well prepared for it, and in several instances the new developments in verse were not sufficiently advanced to satisfy the cultivated tastes of critics.

EDWARD NILES HOOKER

The Johns Hopkins University

³⁶ *Monthly*, XXVIII (1763), 283; *Critical*, XV (1763), 307-10.

³⁷ *Monthly*, XXXII (1765), 241-53. ³⁸ XVIII (1764), 87.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, XLIII (1770), 100.

⁴⁰ III (1757), 258-68.

SHELLEY AND MILTON'S 'CHARIOT OF PATERNAL DEITY'

In his *Influence of Milton*, Professor Raymond D. Havens called attention to the fact that Shelley's lines in *Queen Mab*

The restless wheels of being on their way,
Whose flashing spokes, instinct with infinite life,
Bicker and burn to gain their distant goal (ix. 152-4)

appear to have been borrowed from the description in *Paradise Lost* of that chariot wherein the Son rides to victory over the rebel hosts.¹

That the Miltonic passage,

Forth rushed with whirl-wind sound
The chariot of Paternal Deity,
Flashing thick flames, wheel within wheel; undrawn,
Itself instinct with spirit . . .
And from about him fierce effusion rowled
Of smoke and bickering flame and sparkles dire.
 . . . Under his burning wheels
The steadfast Empyrean shook throughout,
All but the throne itself of God,²

was indeed one which made a profound impression on Shelley's imagination is evidenced by its appearance elsewhere in his work. Its influence is seen first in *The Wandering Jew*,³ where "bickering fire" occurs twice (784, 794), "bickering flame" twice (263, 1322) and "bickering hell-flames" once (305) in the text,⁴ and "bickering flames," "bickering coruscation" in the note to line 764.⁵ It next appears in a letter to Miss Hitchener of November 26, 1811: "Heavens! were I the charioteer of time, his burning wheels would rapidly attain the goal of my aspirations." For the Fairy's car, in *Queen Mab*, Shelley had, of course, models which

¹ *The Influence of Milton on English Poetry* (Cambridge, 1922), p. 230, n. 3.

² *P. L.*, vi. 749 ff.

³ Ed. B. Dobell, Shelley Society Publications, London, 1887.

⁴ These are almost certainly Shelley's lines. See Manfred Eimer, "Zu Shelley's dichtung *The Wandering Jew*," *Anglia*, xxxviii (1914), 445, 447.

⁵ In that portion of the note which is Shelley's addition to the German Museum translation of Schubart. Cf. *ibid.*, 471.

make the Miltonic vehicle appear rather remote;⁶ the following passage, however, shows the infusion of two details from Milton—"flame and sparkles," slightly modified, and "burning wheels":

The magic car moved on.
The night was fair, and countless stars
Studded heaven's dark blue vault;
Just o'er the eastern wave
Peeped the first faint smile of morn.
The magic car moved on—
From the celestial hoofs
The atmosphere in flaming sparkles flew,
And where the burning wheels
Eddied above the mountain's loftiest peak,
Was traced a line of lightning.⁷

In the same poem we have again (ix. 217) the detail of "burning wheels," and Milton's verses are even more strikingly paralleled by the passage singled out by Professor Havens and cited *supra*. In the *Essay on Christianity*, Milton's "wheel within wheel, undrawn, itself instinct with spirit" is obviously involved: "The great community of mankind has been subdivided into ten thousand communit[i]es each organized for the ruin of the other. Wheel within wheel the vast machine was instinct with the restless spirit of desolation."⁸ Finally, Shelley appears to draw upon the Chariot for his fine appreciation of Dante in the *Defense of Poetry*: "His very words are instinct with spirit; each is as a spark, a burning atom of inextinguishable thought."⁹

Shelley's work contains many reminiscences of Milton, but most of these appear in an unassimilated state—mere fossilized remnants of his reading in the older poet. The behavior of the Chariot-passage is in interesting contrast. There was something about it which gained it instant admission to the working stratum of Shelley's mind. From time to time it emerges, and we watch the image in process of losing its chariot character, of being re-

⁶ Cf. W. E. Peck, *Shelley* (Boston, 1927), I, 305-6. One of these—the Ship of Heaven in Southey's *Kehama*—perhaps owes to Milton's chariot in that it is "instinct with thought" (vii. st. 1).

⁷ *Q. M.*, I, 207 ff.

⁸ *Shelley's Prose in the Bodleian Manuscripts*, ed. A. H. Koszul (London, 1910), p. 28.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 100.

fined down to what was for Shelley its essence. Finally it reappears in a supreme phrase.

JOHN HARRINGTON SMITH

Washington University,
Saint Louis

THE AUTHORSHIP OF *LE MYSTÈRE DE GRISELDIS*

Elie Golenistcheff-Koutousoff in his *Histoire de Griseldis en France* (Paris, 1933), pp. 42 ff., has assembled cogent reasons for believing that an early French prose translation of Petrarch's version of the Griselda story was made by Philippe de Mézières. These reasons, in brief, are that (1) the author of the translation speaks of his work in the prologue as a "livre de la vertu du sacrement de mariage," which is the title of a book known to have been written by Philippe, though hitherto thought lost; (2) the author refers to himself as *le povere pelerin* and *le vieil solitaire*, names used by Philippe of himself in his authentic works; (3) the author, like Philippe, had intimate connections with the Celestinians and was devoted to the cult of the Virgin; (4) like Philippe, also, he was interested in the politics of the Orient and had personal relations with Petrarch and with Léon V of Armenia.

To these reasons should be added the fact that in 1395, not long after the French prose translation was made—Golenistcheff-Koutousoff dates it between 1384 and 1389,—at a time when Philippe was urging that England and France make peace and that this peace be cemented by the marriage of King Richard II of England and Isabelle of France, Philippe wrote his *Épître à Richard II*, in which he specifically wishes the king a wife like Griselda and particularly mentions "la cronique autentique du dessus dit marquis de Saluce et de Griseldis, . . . escripte par le solempnel docteur et souverain poète, maistre François Petrac," words which seem to echo those of *le vieil solitaire* when he says in the prologue of his prose translation that he found "ceste histoire en Lombardie entre les gracieuses escriptures du vaillant et solempnel docteur-poete, maistre Fransoys Patrac."¹

¹ See N. Jorga, *Philippe de Mézières* (Bibl. de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes, Vol. 110, 1896), pp. 26, 485 and Golenistcheff-Koutousoff, *op. cit.*, pp. 53, 155. Philippe wrote the *Épître* between May and July, 1395.

However, Philippe's preoccupation with the story of Griselda in 1395 is of further interest because it was in that year that the curious French play on this theme, known as *Le Mystère de Griselidis*, was written.² This play, while containing some additional material, may nevertheless be considered, in its main outlines, as a versified and dramatized version of Philippe's prose. Verbal resemblances are striking throughout. Compare, for example, the following typical passages:

Moy delitoie en liberté
Et en ma franche volenté;
Si est liberté de coraige
Petit trouvée en mariaige;
Ce scevent bien les mariez.

Maiz pour vostre amour suis tournez,
Et me soubmet par amisté
Du tout à vostre volenté,
Or est il vray que marier
Fait moult les vertus varier;
Et s'est une chose doubteuse,
Tres pesant et souspeçonneuse,
Car souvent avient, chose est clere,
Que l'enfant ne ressemble au pere;
Et se aucun bien vient a l'omme,

Tout vient de Dieu, ce en est la
somme,

Si lui recommande humblement
Le sort de mon mariement,
Esperant en sa bonté bele,
Qu'il me ottroit a femme tele
Avec qui vivre puisse en paix
A mon salut desoremaiz,
Et je vous promet et ottroy
A prendre femme et tenir foy,
Pour condescendre a vostre vueil.
Maiz une chose quier et vueil,
Laquelle vous me promettez
Et sanz enfraindre garderez:
C'est que celle que je prendray

Je me delitoie en liberté
et en franche volenté,
laquelle est paou trouvée
en mariage,
ce scevent bien ceulx qui l'ont
esprouvé.

Toutefois, pour vostre amour,
je me sousmés a vostre bon conseil
et a vostre volenté.
Vraye est que mariage

est une chose doubteuse,

et maintefois les enfans
au pere pas ne ressamblent,
toutefois se aucun bien vient a
l'omme,

tout vient de Dieu lassus,

a lui je recommans
le sort de mon mariage,
esperant en sa doulce bonté
qu'il m'octroyera telle
avec laquelle je puisse vivre en pais
et en repos expedient a mon salut.
Je vous octroy, mes amis,
de prendre femme et
le vous promés,
mais de vous je vueil une chose
que vous me promettés
et gardés,
c'est assavoir que celle que je
prendray

² Edited by M.-A. Glomeau, Paris, 1923 and by H. Groeneveld in *Ausgaben und Abhandlungen*, Vol. LXXIX, 1888. The Explicit reads: ci fine le

Par m'election et voudray,
 Fille du prince des Rommains
 Ou d'autre vaillant plus ou moins,
 Selon que bon me semblera,
 Vous et chascun de vous avra
 Agreable et celle honnourrez,
 Aimerez et obeïrez,
 Sanz ce qu'aprez aucunement
 En doiez estre mal content,

N'aucunement en murmurer.

Mystère, ed. Glomeau, pp. 23-4;
 cf. ed. Groeneveld, 441-79.

par ma election, quelle qu'elle soit,
 fille du prince des Romains
 ou autre,

vous le doyés entierement amer
 et honorer,

et qu'il n'ait aucun de vous qui après
 de ma election du mariage doye
 estre mal content,

jugier ne murmurer.

Philippe de Mézières, ed. Golenist-
 cheff-Koutouzoff, p. 159, ll. 57-73.

The dramatist, to be sure, introduces new scenes and new characters, but here and there, throughout the play, passages as closely allied to the prose translation as those just cited may be found.³ Indeed, of the dependence of the play on Philippe's translation—first suggested by the Frères Parfait and later established by Hauvette and especially by Golenistcheff-Koutouzoff's edition of the prose text—there can be no doubt.

The question has occurred to me: could Philippe himself have written the play? No categorical answer can be given, and at first it may seem unlikely that a man who was sixty-eight or sixty-nine years old in 1395, whose recognized works are all in prose, and who was living with Celestinian monks⁴ at the time—though preserving his lay status and his lay interests—could be the author of a dramatic work in verse. Yet it seems highly probable to me that Philippe, if not the actual writer of the play, was its instigator and intimately concerned in its performance.

livre de l'estoire de la marquise de Saluce miz par personnages et rigmé l'an mil ccciiii^{xx} et quinze.

³ See also the brief excerpts printed by Hauvette (*Bulletin italien*, ix [1909], 4) and Gol.-Koutouzoff, *op. cit.*, p. 120. Other long passages in the play—there are many shorter ones—that are directly taken from the prose translation may be listed as follows (references are to the editions of Glomeau and Gol.-Koutouzoff, respectively): pp. 16-8 = pp. 158-9, ll. 28-53; 49 = 161, 16-20; 51 = 162, 23-31; 52-3 = 162-3, 32-57; 54 = 163, 57-61; 72-5 = 165-6, 47-85; 76-7 = 166, 85-99; 78 = 167, 108-16; 87-90 = 168-9, 23-64; 91 = 170, 82-7.

⁴ The Second Bergier's humorous reference to monks (ed. Glomeau, p. 63) and his resolution to be a "bergier amoureux" rather than a "fol hardi" (ed. Glomeau, p. 66) are of course intended to represent the shepherd's—not the author's—ideas.

As we have seen, the character of Griselda was in his thoughts in 1395, and it was his prose translation of Petrarch's tale that the playwright used. Now, Philippe de Mézières was too eminent a person and his literary works far too well-known⁵ to be lightly "borrowed" without his knowledge. He was no poor jongleur, but a distinguished diplomat, traveller and crusader, the intimate adviser of the Pope, "le conseiller, le familier at le commensal" of King Charles V, and "le premier fauconnier," i. e., the preceptor, of the young King Charles VI. (See Jorga, *op. cit.*, pp. 409, 421 and 429). It seems very unlikely that during his own lifetime long passages from his prose translation of Petrarch would be incorporated *verbatim* in a play without his consent.

Of Philippe's connection with the lay theatre there is no record, but we do happen to know that he introduced into Western Europe and personally prepared for performance on the Feast of the Presentation of the Virgin a Latin liturgical play which he was instrumental in having performed both in Venice and Avignon.⁶ Young says of this dramatic ceremony:

Its importance for the history of medieval *mise en scène* could not easily be exaggerated. In few records of the stage are costume, setting, text, and action prescribed in such detail. From the copious rubrics it is clear that we have before us not a mere piece of dramatic liturgy, but rather, a true play. The story is completely presented in the form of action, and the characters are elaborately impersonated (*op. cit.*, II, 244).

This liturgical play, with its copious rubrics, is preserved in Philippe de Mézières' own service-book. Surely, for a man capable of preparing a dramatic performance of this sort, it would be a relatively simple matter to turn his own prose into the dramatic verse form of a *mystère*.

Moreover, the pious tone of the *mystère*, the devotion to the Virgin displayed by its author,⁷ its learned references (to Jason,

⁵ See Jorga's lists, *op. cit.*, pp. vii ff. Many of these works are still unpublished and the attribution to him of the *Somnium Viridarii* together with its French translation, the *Songe du Vergier*, has been questioned. Cf. Molinier, *Les Sources de l'histoire de France*, IV (1904), 112-6 and § 3343. But Mézières' contemporaries could not fail to recognize him as the author of the prose translation of Petrarch because of his revealing references to himself in the prologue.

⁶ See Karl Young, *The Drama of the Medieval Church*, II, 226 ff.

⁷ Jorga, *op. cit.*, p. 29, says: "[il] voua pendant toute sa vie une

Hercules, Bacchus and Ulysses; cf. pp. 13, 64-6, and xiii of Glomeau's edition with Jorga, *op. cit.*, p. 24 ff.),⁸ its phraseology⁹ and even its slight Picardisms,¹⁰ all are consonant with what we know of Philippe and his works.¹¹

Finally, it has already been plausibly conjectured by Glomeau (*op. cit.*, pp. xiv-xvi) that the writing of the play had some connection with the projected marriage of Richard II and Isabelle of France: "les réjouissances nuptiales, qui dominant la pièce, faisaient écho aux événements de l'époque." Now, no one was more concerned in trying to bring about a durable peace between France and England and in trying to cement it by this marriage than Philippe de Mézières (see Jorga, *op. cit.*, 480 ff.). In fact, if one reads the *mystère* with Philippe's letter to Richard II in mind, the play takes on new significance, especially in those opening scenes (neither in Petrarch nor in the prose translation) where the chevaliers and barons of the young Marquis de Saluce express their desire that their lord choose a wife. It is the "quint chevalier," a person of course invented by the playwright, who is ap-

dévotion spéciale [à la Vierge] . . . qui apparaît dans tous ses ouvrages." Cf. the Prologue of the *mystère*.

⁸ "Les œuvres de cet homme de guerre abondent en citations" (Jorga, p. 24).

⁹ Verbal resemblances to Philippe's prose translation have been noted above, but even in the purely dramatic additions there are phrases recalling his; cf., for example, the expression used by the Secont Bergier at the end of the play, *une amoureuse chançonnette*, which unexpectedly echoes the phrase *gracieuses chansonnettes amoureuses* used by Philippe in his *Épître à Richard* (Jorga, p. 486).

¹⁰ Philippe came from Picardy and called himself a *miles Picardus* (Jorga, p. 11). Groeneveld, *op. cit.*, p. xxxvi, reached the conclusion that the work was by a Picard living in Paris, and Glomeau finds in it "quelques rimes ou quelques formes plus particulières au Picard (p. vii).

¹¹ It has been suggested (Golenistcheff-Koutousoff, pp. 121-3) that the play contains an attack upon the reputation of the papal court at Rome. Philippe after 1378 was an enthusiastic partisan of the Avignon pope and of course unfriendly to Rome. Yet, I hesitate to find evidence of partisanship in the play: dramatic exigencies account for the somewhat awkward scene in question and present sufficient justification for the papal action whether one reads *bulles faintives* or *saintives* (Glomeau, p. 101; Groeneveld, l. 1894 a; Petrarch's *simulatas* favors *faintives* here, but the Bishop later calls these *bulles autentiques*, which leaves the reading doubtful).

pointed to acquaint the Marquis with the desire of his knights, and the description of this chevalier by "le secont baron" strikingly resembles a portrait of Philippe de Mézières himself:

Un chevalier a, ancien,
En ceste court, bon catholique,
Et qui aime le bien publique,
Saige, de droit naturel senz,
S'a plus veu que homs de ceenz,
Si est soubtilz et beau parlier
Si que Ulixes le conseiller,
Se ore feust o nous en vie,
Je croy ne l'en passeroit mie.
Si seroit bon de l'en parler.

(ed. Glomeau, p. 13, Groeneveld, II. 232-41)

In short, the man who in the play is to persuade the Marquis to marry is a man exactly like Philippe de Mézières who made a similar appeal to Richard II, a wise and sensible old man, a good Catholic, one devoted to the public welfare, who had seen more of the world than other men of his country, one so subtle and fair of speech that Ulysses, the counselor, were he still alive, would not surpass him.

Accordingly, because of the play's date and its extensive use of Philippe's prose translation, because of Philippe's known interest in another dramatic performance, because the play is consonant in tone and language with Philippe's recognized works and because it connects in theme and purpose with contemporary events which aroused Philippe's fervent concern, I believe the *mystère* was written or directly inspired by Philippe de Mézières himself. If so, the time when it would most fittingly have been performed would have been during the negotiations preceding the marriage of Richard and Isabelle, that is, in July, 1395, and the tradition¹² that the handsome manuscript, with its decorative initials and illustrations, was presented by the author to his sovereign would receive considerable support.

GRACE FRANK

Bryn Mawr College

¹² This tradition, transmitted by the unreliable Chevalier de Mouhy, was questioned by Petit de Julleville, but both Groeneveld and Glomeau are inclined to accept it.

A SUGGESTION AS TO THE SOURCE OF MONTAIGNE'S
TITLE: "ESSAIS"

The expression *coup d'essai* was well known in the sixteenth century. In the mediaeval guilds it had been used to designate the sample of skill presented by a journeyman upon his application to pass up to the rank of master. In this connection it has the meaning of 'masterpiece.' The feat of prowess required of a squire before he could be dubbed 'knight' was known as the *coup d'essai*. The term was also applied to the ceremony of tasting the king's dishes, the intent of which was to guard against poisoning. It was also a term in tennis, a game which was exceedingly popular in France in the sixteenth century and which found a place in the literature of the period, for example, the *Enigme en prophétie* at the end of Rabelais' *Gargantua*. The term *coup d'essai* makes its appearance in the literature of the sixteenth century in the preface to Marot's *Adolescence Clementine* in 1532, where he says: "Ce sont œuvres de jeunesse, ce sont coups d'essay." In this connection the expression has the meaning of 'first attempt,' the definition given in present-day dictionaries. Rabelais uses the expression in the prologue to *Gargantua* in 1534: "A quel propos, en voustre advis, tend ce prelude et coup d'essay?" In 1537 François Sagon "moved partly by professional jealousy, partly by orthodox zeal, published under the title of *Coup d'Essay* a poem in which Marot's poetry, religion and morals were attacked in the most offensive terms." The title of Sagon's poem is a direct hit at Marot's use of the expression *coup d'essay* in the preface to the *Adolescence Clementine*.

In 1540 the Floral Games¹ of Toulouse introduced a feature into the annual poetic contests (May 1-3) which became a custom, and was known as the *Essay*. The *Essay* was a regulation formu-

¹ For account of the Floral Games in the sixteenth century see Dawson, *Toulouse in the Renaissance*, Columbia University Press, 1921, complete edition 1923. The society of the Floral Games was founded in 1323. Throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries it was known as the Consistory of Gay Science; during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries it was known as the College of Rhetoric. In 1694 Louis XIV transformed it into an organization of State, and from then to the present time it has been known as the Floral Games (Académie des Jeux Floraux de Toulouse).

lated in 1540 to meet the difficulty which arose of having to choose from among a number of contestants of equal skill and merit. After unanimously awarding the Violet² to Jehan Corrière, a student in the University of Toulouse, the judges had difficulty in awarding the Marigold and Églantine, for there were four other candidates whose poems appeared to be of equal value. After deliberation it was decided to put the four to a test (*examen*). To each was assigned a certain refrain upon which he was required to construct an impromptu *huitain* or *dixain*. After the verses were completed they were delivered to the Chancellor, who in company with the *Mainteneurs*, *Maîtres* and *Capitouls-bailes*,³ awarded the prizes. In 1545 a similar test was resorted to, mentioned in the *procès-verbal* as the *essay* or *examen*. To five poets was assigned the refrain, "Point n'est à tous parvenir à Corinthe." After having examined the *dixains* composed by the aspirants, the judges awarded the Marigold to Aymar du Vabre. In 1540 two prizes had been awarded after the test, but in 1545 only one, the other two having been decided previously. In 1551 the test is called simply the *Essay*, by which name it continues to be known throughout the records of the *Livre Rouge*, the secretary's book—so called because of its red morocco binding. This book contains the secretary's record of the proceedings of the annual meetings of the Floral Games from 1513 to 1641. It is preserved in the archives of the Académie des Jeux Floraux at Toulouse. Beginning with 1551 the *Essay* became a regular feature of the annual meetings, and continued until at least 1641 when the records of the *Livre Rouge* ceased. After the sonnet became popular in France it displaced the *quatrain*, *huitain*, and *dixain* as the form required for the *Essay*.

Below are specimens of the lines to which the youthful contestants were required to compose impromptu poems from year to year:

² At the annual contests flowers wrought in gold and silver were awarded as prizes. For full account of the prizes see Gélis, *Histoire critique des Jeux Floraux*, Toulouse, Privat, 1912.

³ The Chancellor was the presiding officer, the *Mainteneurs* were the regular members constituting the self-perpetuating body, the *Maîtres* were the poets who by virtue of having won three prizes were admitted to membership, and the *Capitouls-bailes* were representatives from the body

"Le vice et la vertu ne sont jamais ensemble."

"Le désir de régner a engendré les troubles."

"Le naucher qui jamais sa nef ne laisse perdre."

"Aymer le vray poète afin d'estre poète."

"Ung chemin aus vertus, plusieurs chemins au vice."

"Le miroir bien poly qui reçoit toute forme."

While there is no documentary evidence to prove it and Montaigne is silent on the subject, it has been generally agreed among scholars that Montaigne pursued his course in law at the University of Toulouse. He tells us in the *Essais* that he completed the course at the Collège de Guyenne in Bordeaux at the age of thirteen. Since he was born in 1533, he completed his secondary education in 1546. It is conjectured from the character of his learning displayed in the *Essais* that he then took the two years of the course in philosophy at Bordeaux, and that between 1548 and 1554, when he became a *conseiller* in the *Cours des Aides* at Périgueux, he completed the law course at Toulouse. The University of Toulouse was a very flourishing institution in the earlier Renaissance. Around 1540 it is said to have had as many as ten thousand students. Humanism and Reform had strong footholds there, and the school of law became so outstanding that in 1551 Henry II declared Toulouse the best university in his kingdom for the study of jurisprudence, and it is said that at least four thousand students listened to the lectures on law of Jean de Coras. Toulouse produced in this period the celebrated Cujas known to posterity as the "Father of Modern Law." In the sixteenth century most of the contestants at the annual meetings of the Floral Games were students in the University, many of them law students. In 1534 Etienne Dolet, who in 1532 had enrolled at Toulouse as a student in law, entered the contest, but did not receive a prize.

Since the connection between the students and the Floral Games was so close, it is quite certain that Montaigne would have been familiar with the annual programs and the trial by *Essay*. Since

of city aldermen who represented the city of Toulouse in an official capacity at the annual meetings of the Floral Games.

* For information on the University of Toulouse in the sixteenth century see Dawson, *Toulouse in the Renaissance*, Part II, Columbia University Press, 1923. For Etienne Dolet as student at Toulouse see same work Part III.

the *Essay*⁵ was an impromptu trial or test it is possible that Montaigne caught the idea of his title from it, as he uses the word in precisely the same sense as it was used at Toulouse. Also there is a similarity between the composition of the *Essays* and the composition of the poems for the *Essay* at Toulouse. In his earlier essays Montaigne uses an anecdote or a quotation from the ancients as his starting point, around which he clusters his own observations.

JOHN C. DAWSON

The University of Alabama

RESTORATION PROMPT NOTES AND STAGE PRACTICES

As the student of Restoration dramatic literature mulls over the musty texts of plays which in that theatre-loving age really sprang into life upon the boards and tickled the fancy of a superficially genteel audience, his mind is often lured across the footlights and behind the scenes. But to gain a good look backstage, he finds, taxes his imagination to the utmost. Outside the published plays themselves there are almost no descriptive references to practices within "the House" (that portion of the Restoration theatre behind the proscenium), and even the printed dramas with their generally scanty directions afford by no means a really satisfying picture of stage conditions. Prompt-book copies, an obvious and fruitful source of information, do not exist in the case of a single Restoration play. The only item of that category dating from the period is an octavo text of James Shirley's *The Sisters*, annotated with prompt directions for its revival at the Theatre Royal in the late 1660's.¹ In addition to this unique and valuable exhibit, belonging to the library of Sion College, London, the contemporary editions of some eighteen Restoration dramas preserve prompter's notations in one form or another.² Almost all these texts, how-

⁵ For a complete history of the custom of the *Essay* from 1540 to 1641 see Dawson, "The Custom of the Essay in the Poetic Contests of the College of Rhetoric at Toulouse," *Howard College Studies in Howard College Bulletin*, LXXXI, No. 4, Dec., 1923.

¹ This volume was first described by Montague Summers, *TLS.*, June 24, 1920, p. 400 ff.

² *The Mulberry Garden* (1668); *Juliana* (1671); *The Dumb Lady*

ever, display mere traces of the original prompt script; only four or five offer information of any real significance. Yet the curious scholar has to turn to this handful of remains from theatrical scripts, and to the sole Restoration prompt book aforementioned, in order *not* to miss several choice details on his fanciful visit backstage. Only from this little sheaf of extant prompt notes can he secure glimpses of certain interesting matters connected with Restoration play production.

The glimpses which first catch his eye are of those important personages, the prompters, and of their peculiar devices for directing the stage personnel. The Restoration prompter with his manifold responsibilities at every performance acts really as major-domo of backstage operations. There in an alley close behind the proscenium he hovers nervously, book in hand. The tools of his authority appear prominently on his person, a little bell hanging from his arm and a whistle suspended on a chain about his neck. Each of these instruments has its own particular function, and the province of each is strictly observed by the prompter.

By the tinkling of the little bell, the prompter, whenever music is called for in the course of the production on the boards, signals the fiddlers in the music room over the stage to begin their playing. Sometimes his signal rings forth within the act, as illustrated by the first act of William Mountfort's farce, *The Life and Death of Doctor Faustus* (D. G. c. 1686), where the original prompt direction has been preserved and reads: "*Ring. Good and bad Angel descends.*" That is to say, the prompter, after having a little before warned the two angels to be ready to descend from the billowy clouds suspended aloft (as a previous prompt note discloses), at the proper moment rings his bell to signal for the musical accompaniment, and thus he simultaneously initiates the descent of the angels. Such bell-ringing by the prompter within the act is to be imagined no uncommon occasion despite this one Restoration relic of its occurrence, for many plays of that era demand music under similar circumstances.

(1672); *The Careless Lovers* (1673); *The Mistaken Husband* (1675); *Tom Essence* (1677); *The Revenge* (1680); *Theodosius* (1680); *The Injured Princess* (1682); *Constantine the Great* (1684); *Valentinian* (1685); *A Fool's Preferment* (1688); *The Treacherous Brothers* (1691); *Bussy D'Ambois* (1691); *Guzman* (1693); *The Richmond Heiress* (1693); *The Life and Death of Dr. Faustus* (1697); *The Albion Queens* (1704).

Whether a piece has musical interludes or not, however, the prompter always sounds his bell at the end of every act, except the last, in order to start the orchestra on the entr'acte music. As one of the many survivals from the pre-Commonwealth theatre, the custom of an act-interval filled with song or orchestral composition is universally observed in the Restoration playhouses, no matter what the character of the production. The extant evidence for this as a general practice is conclusive, because it comes from the following pieces of widely varying nature and date—namely, Shirley's *The Sisters*, a romantic tragi-comedy revived c. 1668-70; Sedley's *The Mulberry Garden*, a social comedy of 1668; Lacy's *The Dumb Lady*, a farce of 1672; and Lee's *Theodosius*, a tragedy of 1680. The prompt notes of these plays agree in demonstrating that the prompter regularly gives a preliminary call warning to the musicians between twenty and thirty lines before the close of an act. His conventional call at this point is "Act ready." Then, just as the final couplet or line of the act is being uttered, the prompter tinkles his bell for the orchestra to commence the music of the entr'acte. In the half-dozen extant references his action is denoted by the simple direction, "Ring."

Now as to the second instrument of the prompter's authority, the whistle,—it is directed toward that other indispensable body of workers backstage, the scene-shifters. At the sound of the whistle, they hasten to lay hold on the flats which, sliding easily in floor grooves, are swiftly shoved either off or on the stage, as the case may demand. Of this highly important prompter's whistle Aaron Hill says, when writing about the eighteenth century theatres, "this is an Instrument of great Use and Significance: . . . *Dr. Faustus's* celebrated Wand has not a more arbitrary and extensive Power, than this musical Machine: At the least Blast of it, I have seen Houses move, as it were, upon Wings, Cities turned into Forests, and dreary Desarts converted into superb Palaces."³ In view of the fact that the whistle blast probably was introduced as a regular prompter's signal after movable scenery became the order of the day in 1661, it is somewhat strange that the sole Restoration revelation of the whistle in use comes from the Theatre Royal prompt book for Shirley's *The Sisters*. Throughout its text the changes of scenery are carefully

³ See *The Prompter*, No. 1, Tuesday, November 12, 1734.

indicated and described by manuscript interpolations. Alongside the description of each new scene invariably stands a prompt symbol, a circle with a dot in the center. This striking mark, which may be observed in a number of eighteenth-century theatre scripts, was presumably invented after the Restoration as a conventional sign for the prompter. It is to be interpreted "Whistle for change." And what a deal of whistling the prompter must do for a production of *The Sisters*, where there are twelve changes of scenery.

The scene-shifters, however, are kept as much on the jump changing scenes for the new Restoration plays as for the revivals of pre-Commonwealth drama. Yet some conventional limit on the number of different flats used in any one production may possibly exist, if the extraordinary close-up on Restoration sets in actual use which the prompt notes of Orrery's comedy, *Guzman*, afford, really evidences what it is tempting to believe from the implications therein. This piece, first acted at the Duke's Theatre in 1669, was printed a quarter-century later from the playhouse script with all the prompter's directions for Acts II-V, including notations as to what stage sets were actually employed in the original production. Thus *Guzman* has the unique honor to be the one Restoration play, the exact staging of which remains completely recorded to this day. Standing by the prompter on an afternoon when *Guzman* is being performed, the backstage visitor sees in action on the grooved runways to the forepart of the "House" only four "flat scenes," arranged from front to rear as follows: (1) "The new flat scene of the Piazza"; (2) "the scene with the Chimney in it"; (3) "a flat scene of a chamber"; (4) "the Queen of Hungary's chamber," so-called from its original pictorial function in Orrery's tragedy, *Mustapha*, four years before. Throughout the performance the front pair of flats represents solely the piazza, while the last pair always depicts a chamber in Leonora's house. The second pair of flats, however, is called upon for two different locales, denoted in the play text as "Guzman's House" and "Francisco's House," and the third pair serves also for two distinct scenes, described as "Piracco's House" and "Guzman's House." This curious doubling of conventional interior sets, where complete differentiation would be theatrically more effective and could be had at no extra expense, suggests deliberate restriction of scenery dictated by some other reason than economy. Most

apropos, there flashes into mind that well-known sketch by Sir Christopher Wren, supposedly a cross-section view of the first Drury Lane playhouse of 1674. It pictures on the stage wall behind the proscenium seven grooves which are divided into two groupings of four and three respectively. The group of four grooves nearer the proscenium obviously represents the runways which hold in place the regular scene shutters, as distinguished from the three back flats. In this connection also, Webb's plan of the Rutland House stage shows only four grooves for the ordinary scene shutters, and there *The Siege of Rhodes* was produced with four flat scenes and a scene "in relief." It is at least barely possible, therefore, that the customary arrangements of the scenic machinery in the Restoration theatres provided for the employment of not more than four different flat scenes.

Whatever the truth about this conjectured restriction of Restoration stage sets, the *Guzman* prompt notes do certainly bring to light the interesting fact that recurrent textual locales, such as "Guzman's House" in the Orrery comedy, are not necessarily represented in the actual Restoration stage production by the same set throughout. The interior of Guzman's house is portrayed once by "the scene with the chimney in it," and then, on the second occasion, by "a flat scene of a chamber." Clearly the producer has not paid too much heed to the playwright's instructions as to scenery, but has changed the stage picture from a living room to a bed-chamber in accordance with hints furnished only by the dialogue. Such a variation, unauthorised in a sense, but rendered desirable as a means of greater scenic harmony with the play's action, would seem an important indication of a tendency on the part of the Restoration producers toward a more studied realism in stage setting than has generally been imagined by the theatre historians.

WILLIAM S. CLARK

University of Cincinnati

FYNES MORYSON AND JONSON'S PUNTARVOLO

In *Every Man out of his Humour*, Puntarvolo's eccentricity or humour is "dealing upon returns," i. e., putting out money to receive more upon his return from a journey. Early in Act II, Puntarvolo announces his latest project of this kind:

I do intend, this year of jubilee [*i. e.*, 1600] coming on, to travel: and, because I will not altogether go upon expense, I am determined to put forth some five thousand pound, to be paid me, five for one, upon the return of myself, my wife, and my dog from the Turk's court in Constantinople. If all, or either of us miscarry in the journey, 'tis gone: if we be successful, why there will be five and twenty thousand pound to entertain time withal.¹

Later, Puntarvolo is compelled to modify his plan to the extent of substituting his cat for his wife, because his wife, he says, is "out of her humour" and will not go.² He has a notary "draw the indentures" in elaborate detail,³ and begins to look for prospective speculators.

In the dénouement of the comedy, however, his well-laid plans go awry. At the opening of Act v, Puntarvolo, accompanied by Fastidious Brisk and Fungoso, arrives at the Palace Stairs to assist in the intrigue to dupe Saviolina, the court lady. Not being able to take his inseparable dog into the Palace, he intrusts the animal to an unknown groom until his return. He considers himself shrewd in not revealing to the groom the value of the precious dog. The groom, disappointed in not receiving a fee and suspecting that he is being duped, abandons the dog to Macilente, who poisons it. Upon coming out of the Palace and learning that his dog is dead, Puntarvolo realizes that his speculative scheme is ruined before he has begun his journey to Constantinople. He is thus put out of his humour.

While it has been generally understood that Jonson was satirizing in Puntarvolo's humour a prevalent vogue of speculating upon travels abroad, no one, so far as I have been able to discover, has pointed to a specific contemporary instance of this kind. I have recently found one so strikingly similar to Puntarvolo's project that it is, I think, worth recording.

In the year 1597 (about two years before Jonson was writing *Every Man out of his Humour*),⁴ Fynes Moryson,⁵ an Elizabethan

¹ II, i (*Works*, I, 89. I cite the Gifford-Cunningham edition of Jonson).

² III, i (*Works*, I, 97).

³ IV, iv (*Works*, I, 113).

⁴ Jonson was working on the play during 1599; cf. the Oxford edition of Jonson, by Herford and Simpson, I, 373.

⁵ Moryson was born in 1566, a younger son of Thomas Moryson of Cadeby, Lincolnshire. Entering Peterhouse, Cambridge, he took his B.A. and

traveller, returned from a trip to Constantinople. In his *Itinerary*,⁶ Moryson describes this trip in detail. Even more significant than his visit to Constantinople is the fact that, before beginning the journey on 8 December 1595, both he and his brother Henry, who accompanied him, put out money upon returns in just such a speculative scheme as that of Puntarvolo. In the *Itinerary* Moryson writes thus about his proposed second journey:

. . . being newly returned home, I thought the going into more remote parts would be of little use to me, yet I had an itching desire to see Jerusalem, the fountaine of Religion, and Constantinople. . . .

Being of this mind when I returned to England, it happened that my brother Henrie was then beginning that voyage, having to that purpose put out some foure hundred pounds, to be repaied twelve hundred pounds upon his returne from those two Cities, and to lose it if he died in the journey. . . . My brother . . . thought this putting out of money, to be an honest means of gaining, at least the charges of his journey, and the rather, because it had not then been heard in England, that any man had gone this long journey by land, nor any like it, excepting only Master John Wrath, whom I name for honour. . . .⁷

In his usual garrulous manner, Moryson goes on to defend his brother's action, citing as prevalent other speculative schemes of a much lower order. He also, he says, gave out "upon like conditions money to some few friends," but later changed his mind, in view of the fact

that these kind of adventures were growne very frequent, whereof some were indecent, some ridiculous; and that they were in great part undertaken by bankrouths, and men of base condition, I might easily judge that in short time they would become disgraceful.⁸

Despite this prick of conscience, the temptation proved too strong for him, as witness this later statement:

M. A. degrees. He was made Fellow in 1584. In 1589 he obtained a license to travel, and was away on his first journey from 1591 to 1595 (see Sir Sidney Lee's article in *DNB.*, xxxix, 172-173).

⁶ The full title is: *An Itinerary Containing His Twelve Yeeres Travell through the Twelve Dominions of Germany, Bohmerland, Sweitzerland, Netherland, Denmarke, Poland, Italy, France, England, Scotland, & Ireland.* The work was originally published in folio in 1617 (see Sidney Lee, *loc. cit.*, xxxix, 173). I have cited the four-volume edition published at Glasgow: James MacLehose and Sons, 1907.

⁷ *Itinerary*, I, 425. Who "Master John Wrath" was I have not been able to discover.

⁸ *Ibid.*, I, 426.

Onely I gave out one hundred pound to receive three hundred at my return. . . . I moreover gave out to five friends one hundred pounds, with condition that they should have it if I died, or after three yeeres should repay it with one hundred and fifty pound gaine if I returned; which I hold a disadvantageous adventure to the giver of the money. Neither did I exact this money of any man by sute of Law after my returne, which they willingly and presently paid me, onely some few excepted, who retaining the very money I gave them, deale not therein so gentleman-like with me, as I did with them.⁹

Having confessed to participation to this extent, Moryson plunges into another verbose defence of his action, saying that the practice of giving out money upon returns "was first used in Court, and among the very Noble men . . . if bankerouts, Stage-players, and men of base condition, have drawne this custome into contempt," he cannot see that "courtiers and Gentlemen have reason to forbear it."

Since Moryson says that dealing upon returns was a common practice, it is evident that Jonson was satirizing in *Puntarvolo* a contemporary vice: in his own words, "stripping the ragged follies of the time naked as at their birth."¹⁰ This is another proof, then, that Jonson presents in his satirical comedy a truly realistic "image of the times."

Whether Jonson had in mind Moryson or any other contemporary speculator upon returns is, of course, uncertain. There is no evidence that Jonson knew Moryson's reputation as a traveller; if there were such evidence, one could not say conclusively that any one man inspired his portrayal of *Puntarvolo*. Jonson, moreover, stoutly asserted many times that he did not direct his satirical thrusts at any particular individual.¹¹

On the other hand, it seems certain that Jonson's practice in satire is often inconsistent with his assertions. Instances of personal satire in his early comedies may be cited. In *The Case is Altered*, Gabriel Harvey is apparently lampooned in the character

⁹ *Ibid.*, I, 427-428.

¹⁰ Induction to *Every Man out of his Humour* (*Works*, I, 65).

¹¹ See the "Apologetical Dialogue" attached to *The Poetaster*; the Prologue to *Epicoene*; the Dedication to *Volpone*; *The Magnetic Lady*, Intermean between Acts II and III; the *Discoveries* (ed. Schelling), pp. 72-73.

Juniper.¹² In *Every Man out of his Humour*, it seems certain that Marston is ridiculed in Clove and Dekker in Orange.¹³ *The Poetaster*, one of the plays connected with the Stage Quarrel, is almost entirely a comedy of personal satire.¹⁴ It is possible, therefore, that other individuals of the time were satirized in the "humours" of these early comedies. One wonders whether it is merely a striking coincidence that Fynes Moryson had returned from Constantinople and was collecting, or attempting to collect, the fruits of his speculative scheme, immediately prior to the time Jonson was planning and writing his first comedies of humours.

Elon College

H. L. SNUGGS

ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY IN JOHN FORD'S *PERKIN WARBECK*

Scholarship has given slight attention to a question which occurs to everyone who reads John Ford's chronicle play *Perkin Warbeck*. The plebeian hero of this drama claims, with every appearance of sincerity, that he is the rightful king of England. Is this pretender a scoundrel who can act a part superbly, or is he mentally unbalanced?¹

The chaplain Urswick, a character in the play, gives a hint regarding the dramatist's intention. As Perkin, still stoutly asserting his royalty, goes to the gallows to pay for his folly, Urswick comments:

Thus witches,
Possess'd, even [to] their deaths deluded, say
They have been wolves and dogs, and sail'd in egg-shells

¹² See C. R. Baskervill, *English Elements in Jonson's Early Comedy*, p. 94; W. E. Selin's edition of *The Case is Altered*, *Yale Studies in English*, p. xli.

¹³ See the Herford-Simpson ed., I, 24-25, 382.

¹⁴ See J. H. Penniman's intro. to his ed. of *The Poetaster and Satiromastix* (Belles Lettres Series); H. S. Mallory's ed. of *The Poetaster*, *Yale Studies in English*, pp. xxiii ff.; the Herford-Simpson ed., I, 415 ff.

¹ Felix E. Schelling, (*The English Chronicle Play*, pp. 262-65) and M. Joan Sargeant (*John Ford*, pp. 79-80) discuss this problem intelligently but lack conclusive evidence. Other critics, I think, have nothing very valuable to offer.

Over the sea, and rid on fiery dragons,
 Pass'd in the air more than a thousand miles,
 All in a night:—the enemy of mankind
 Is powerful, but false, and falsehood confident.²

The ideas which lie behind this passage, apparently ideas of some currency, are expounded at length in Reginald Scot's *Discoverie of Witchcraft* (1584).³ According to Scot, there is no such thing as witchcraft. Those who claim sincerely to have purchased supernatural powers from the Devil are victims of a mental disorder produced by the humor melancholy:

. . . melancholie abounding in their head, and occupieng their braine,⁴ hath . . . depraved their judgements. . . . [They] imagine, they are witches and by witchcraft can worke woonders, and doo what they list. . . .⁵

In their

drouisie minds the divell⁶ hath gotten a fine seat; so as, what mischeefe, mischance, calamitie, or slaughter is brought to passe, they are easilie persuaded the same is doone by themselves. . . . They are . . . so firme and stedfast in their opinions, as whosoever shall onelie have respect to the constancie of their words uttered, would easilie beleieve they were true indeed.⁷

Such persons, on trial for witchcraft, make preposterous confessions which, as they know, will mean death.

² v, iii. King Henry, like Urswick, considers Perkin demented; see v, ii.

³ One finds a passage in this work which may have influenced Ford's phraseology: Some writers, says Scot, claim that witches can "flie in the aire, and danse with divels. . . . Som saie they can . . . take the forms and shapes of asses, woolves, ferrets, cowes, apes, horssees, dogs, &c. . . . [Some affirm that witches can] saile in an egge shell, a cockle or muscle shell, through and under the tempestuous seas. . . ."—ed. Brinsley Nicholson (London, 1886), p. 8.

⁴ Dr. Timothy Bright, in *A Treatise of Melancholie* (1586), describes the noxious effects which the melancholic humors and the vapors rising from them have upon the brain and the mental faculties; see pp. 102, 110-11, *et passim*. Similar ideas appear, somewhat confusedly, in Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*; see ed. A. R. Shilleto, I, 430-37.

⁵ *Discoverie*, p. 41.

⁶ One reads in Burton's *Anatomy* that "Melancholy is called *Balneum Diaboli*" because the Devil is best able to tempt and delude melancholic persons (I, 228). Urswick means the Devil, of course, when he speaks of "the enemy of mankind."

⁷ *Discoverie*, p. 5.

A much later writer, John Webster, presents the same thesis in similar terms: Those who think themselves witches confidently believe and assert

that they are really changed into Wolves, Hares, Dogs, Cats, Squirrels, and the like; and that they flye in the Air . . . when all these are but the meer effects of the imaginative function depraved by the fumes of the melancholick humor.⁸

Urswick has noticed that Perkin, like self-styled witches, has stubbornly clung to strange and incredible avowals even in the face of death. Evidently he believes that Perkin, like the witches, is melancholic.

But can Perkin's conduct be linked any more specifically with melancholia? According to Scot, one finds a great variety of delusions and fixed ideas among melancholy persons. Just as some believe themselves witches, others imagine "that they are monarchs and princes, and that all other men are their subjects. . . ." ⁹ According to Robert Burton,

If an ambitious man become melancholy, he forthwith thinks he is a King, an Emperor, a Monarch. . . . *Francisco Sansovino* records of a melancholy man [who] would not be induced to believe but that he was *Pope*, gave pardons, made Cardinals, &c. *Christophorus à Vega* makes mention of another of his acquaintance, that thought he was a King driven from his Kingdom, and was very anxious to recover his estate.¹⁰

Edward Reynolds writes that some melancholy men think

themselves turned into Wolves, Horses, or other Beasts; others [please] themselves with Conceits of great Wealth and Principalities . . . being all but the delusions and waking Dreames of a distempered Fancie.¹¹

Thomas Walkington tells a story of a melancholy man who believed that he was God Almighty.¹²

From evidence in his other plays, especially *The Lover's Melancholy*, we know that Ford was greatly interested in the multifarious mental abnormalities attributed to melancholy by the

⁸ *The Displaying of Supposed Witchcraft* (1677), p. 33.

⁹ *Discoverie*, p. 41.

¹⁰ *Anatomy*, I, 464.

¹¹ *A Treatise of the Passions and Faculties of the Soule of Man* (1640), p. 29.

¹² *The Optick Glasse of Humors* (1664), p. 138. This work appeared first in 1607.

learned writers of the period. It is reasonable to suppose, then, that Ford conceived of Warbeck as a melancholic with the delusion of grandeur. Apparently Urswick is speaking for the playwright when he compares Perkin to melancholy persons who fancy themselves endowed with supernatural powers. The better informed members of a Carolinian audience, upon Urswick's hint, would have perceived melancholic symptoms in Perkin's behavior.

The chronicles which Ford used or may have used as sources (those of Bacon, Gainsford, Holinshed, and Hall) represent Perkin as an impudent rascal who is under no illusions regarding his base origin. But he is no rogue and no hypocrite in Ford's play. By making him a psychopathic case of him, Ford has given him the sincerity and dignity requisite in a tragic hero. It is not surprising that the author of *The Lover's Melancholy* should have created a protagonist of this unusual nature.

LAWRENCE BABB

Northwestern University

PARALLELS BETWEEN *SOLIMAN AND PERSEDA* AND GARNIER'S *BRADAMANTE*

Miss Marion Grubb¹ presents evidence that certain passages in *Soliman and Perseda* may be imitated from Garnier's *Bradamante*. As a typical illustration of Renaissance modes of composition, these parallels are worth a critical examination. One should notice that the passage in Garnier is constructed as an Erasmian theme on proverbs, a mode of composition to which Ascham objects, saying that Princess Elizabeth, that is, Ascham, "cannot endure those foolish imitators of Erasmus, who have tied up the Latin tongue in those wretched fetters of proverbs."² But Elizabethan schoolmasters continued to treat this type of theme as fundamental, and Brinsley in 1612 gives elaborate instructions upon it. Evidently, Garnier had also been taught this type of writing.

Garnier begins properly with a *definitio*. "Seule on ne doit priser la contree où nous sommes."³ This merely reverses the

¹ *MLN.*, L, 169-171.

² Giles, *Ascham*, I, lxiv.

³ Foerster, *Bradamante* (1883), II. 580-83, 587-9.

usual definition of *patria*; "urbs, siue alius locus, in quo nati sumus," to quote the contemporary Calepine. Garnier then advances his first commonplace argument in his next two lines,

Tout ce terrestre rond est le pais des hommes,
Comme l'air des oiseaux, et des poissons la mer.

This is a translation of a proverb which is quoted in nearly all the collections as it occurs in the first book of Ovid's *Fasti*,

Omne solum forti patria est, ut piscibus aequor,
Vt uolueri uacuo quicquid in orbe patet.⁴

In his commentary on this passage in Ovid, Paulus Marsus explains,

Loquitur ex sententia, uiro forti ubiq; esse patriā, iuxta illud:
Omnibus est inquam communis patria tellus,
Vt uacuum uolueri, piscibus utq; mare est.

It is the second form of the proverb, given in this note, that Garnier has translated line for line, phrase for phrase, though fortunately for our purpose not quite construction for construction. It is not the very similar form in Ovid. The next line in Garnier is, "Vn lieu comme vn estuy ne nous doit enfermer." This seems to be a quotation from the second *Paradox* of Cicero, regularly placed in the collections under *exilium*, the opposite of *patria*. "Exilium terribile est iis, quibus quasi circumscriptus est habitandi locus, non iis qui omnem orbem terrarum unam urbem esse ducunt." At least, the idea is there, and has not required much rephrasing.

We may omit with Miss Grubb the three-line interruption and transition of the companion speaker, and pursue our still quoted theme in the next speech, "Le pais est par tout où l'on se trouue bien." The first half of this line is a literal translation from an adage which Miss Grubb quotes in a form that occurs in Cicero's *Tusculans*, also in *Ad Gallionem De Remediis Fortuitorum*, attributed to Seneca, etc., "Patria est ubicumque est bene." The wording of the latter half of Garnier's line suggests that he may have been thinking also of the comment of Erasmus upon a similar proverbial line from the *Plutus* of Aristophanes, translated into Latin thus, "Illic enim patria est, vbi tibi sit bene." Erasmus collects several adages, including these, on the theme of *patria*,

⁴ Ovid, *Fastorum Libri VI*, etc. (Basle, 1550), p. 60.

and comments on the one from Aristophanes, "Dicuntur haec a Mercurio, cupiente uel caelo relicto, in Chremyli iam diuitis adscisci familiam. Vsqueadeo credebat ibi demum esse patriam homini, ubicunq. feliciter ageret: illic exilium, vbi parum commode viueret."⁵ Garnier translates literally, "Patria est ubicumque," and very nearly so, "commode viueret," though the idea itself is in the previous proverb. At least, Garnier is using some form of this adage. The last two lines are no more original:

La terre est aux mortels une maison commune:
Dieu seme en tous endroits nostre bonne fortune.

The first of these lines is a sentiment said in the quotation books to be attributed by Stobaeus to Musonius. "Communem omnium hominum patriam dicebat esse ipsum mundum." The final line appears to be the heading statement by Erasmus of a proverbial idea, "Deus vndecumq. iuuat, si modo propitius."⁶

Here is an excellent illustration of a common form of "original" composition, not unused by Shakspeare, and used fundamentally by Bacon in his *Essays*. It will be noticed that Garnier's originality consisted in going directly to the proverbs and selecting for translation the ones which most nearly suited his *definitio*. His mode of structure and his close translation make it certain that Garnier is the "original" author of the passage quoted.

The parallel passages noted by Miss Grubb in *Soliman and Perseda* come directly from this sentential background, not through Garnier.

Sooth to say, the earth is my country
As the aire to the fowle, or the marine moisture
To the red guild fish . . .
Each place is my habitation;
Therefore each country's word is mine to pronounce . . .
And where a man liues well, there is his country.⁷

The first three lines are from the proverb quoted by Marsus, as were two of those from Garnier. But the author of *Soliman and Perseda* translates directly, not through Garnier.

Omnibus est inquam communis patria tellus,
Vt uacuum uolueri, piscibus utq; mare est.

⁵ Erasmus, *Adagia* (Florence, 1575), p. 520.

⁶ Erasmus, *Adagia* (Florence, 1575), p. 990.

⁷ *Soliman and Perseda*, I, iii, 79-81, 112-13; IV, ii, 7.

The second line especially has been translated literally, construction and all. "Vt uacuum uolucris," "As the aire to the fowle." Garnier alters the construction to the genitive plural, the author of *Soliman and Perseda* retains the dative singular. The construction of the second half of the line is also retained. Only now the author has enlarged his fish by means of what Armado would call a "congruent epitheton," and has in equally conventional way varied "sea" into "marine moisture." There can be no doubt that the author of *Soliman and Perseda* is translating directly the same proverb which Garnier used, this fact accounting for the close parallel. Since the *Fasti* found regularly a place in grammar school, and since the commentary of Marsus was widely current with it, both Garnier and the author of *Soliman* may have found their proverb there. Incidentally, Shakspeare himself doubtless acquired early from the *Fasti* the information which he was later to use in *Lucrece*.

The next two lines from *Soliman*, somewhat further on but still in the same connection, repeat the idea, though not in significant fashion. The final line quoted by Miss Grubb—from the other end of the play at that—is another of the proverbs used by Garnier. It is not, however, in the form used by Garnier, but in that given by Erasmus in *De Conscribendis Epistolis*, a regular textbook on epistles, the next stage in grammar school above simple themes, "Ubicunque bene sumus, in patria sumus."⁸ This form became the current one in England, being quoted in *Wit's Commonwealth* as, "Wheresoeuer we may live well, there is our Country." The statement in *Soliman* is a variant from this form, which was thus probably already in English before *Soliman* was written, though I have not checked to see, since it is not necessary for the present purpose. The whole claim to relationship between the two passages, then, lies in their common sentential sources.⁹ They have no direct connection whatever.

If to nothing else, perhaps this note may call attention to the

⁸ Erasmus, *Opera* (1703), I, 430.

⁹ It is amusing to note that the proverb hunters broke a couple of proverbs out of Garnier's passage and put them back into the same patriotic heap of Latin proverbs whence they had originally been derived—"from the great deep, to the great deep." See Garnerius, Philip, *Thesaurus Adagiorum Gallico-Latinorum* (Frankfort, 1625), pp. 563-4.

necessity of detailed study upon all phases of Renaissance composition. Certainly the hordes of parallels and other facts which we are gathering are worthless until they are interpreted in their proper background.

T. W. BALDWIN

University of Illinois

FALSTAFF IN THE *MERCURIUS AULICUS*

The number of the *Mercurius Aulicus* for the week *From July 13. to July 20. 1645.* ends with an interesting Shakespeare allusion (p. 1672):

But besides this *new Colonell* there's another newly peeped forth to command all the North, one Major Generall *Poyntz* (sure he was borne *Major Generall*) but 'tis not *Poyntz* who fought so valiantly that Sir *Iohn* tooke him and another for eleven men in buckram.

FINIS

P. BEATTIE MITCHELL

Santa Monica, California

BENEDICT VON WATT'S "WAS ZU EIM SCHÖNEN HAUSZ GEHORE"

According to a note by Theodor Hampe,¹ the Meistersinger Benedict von Watt wrote verses listing household utensils. Since I have long been collecting materials connected with this minor literary form, I obtained a photostat of this text in *Cod. Berol. Germ. Fol. 24*, foll. 246^{a-b}.² As appears from the verses below, Hampe was misled by the title. Watt's *Meisterlied* has nothing to do with the versified lists of household utensils, but is an episode from the siege of Antwerp. Since few *Meisterlieder* belonging to the period from the death of Hans Sachs to the decay of the art in the early seventeenth century are accessible, I print the text.

¹ *Mitteilungen des Vereins für die Geschichte der Stadt Nürnberg*, xi (1895), 176-77; *Euphōrion*, iv (1897), 28, n. 3.

² For assistance I am indebted to the kindness of Oberbibliothekar Professor Dr. Hugo Hepding of Giessen and the officials of the library. I am greatly obliged to Professor Charles Goetsch for a careful transcription of the text.

The "Grundweise," in which this Meisterlied is composed, is a favorite metre of the schools for the versification of tales and jests.³ The singers ascribed the invention of the metre to Heinrich von Meissen (Frauenlob), but apparently they were in error. No authentic verses by Frauenlob exist in this metre. The ascription is found only in the anthologies of *Meisterlieder*. Gustav Roethe characterizes the metre as "late" (*ein später Ton*) rather than medieval in form. This ascription exemplifies the uncertainty about the invention of the metres of *Meistergesang* and suggests that a careful examination of the nearly fifty metres ascribed to Frauenlob is in order.

The Martin von Rosz referred to in the Meisterlied is Martin van Rossem of Geldern, called Maarten de Zwarte. In the year 1542, he laid waste the country around Malines. Possibly the incident narrated in the Meisterlied belongs to this time. The householder's fear was wellfounded; tradition declares that Maarten van Rossem coined the epigram "De brandstichting is de krijgsmagnificat." Benedict von Watt appears to have learned the story from a source favorable to the general. In modern Belgian tradition children's songs have confused Maarten van Rossem and St. Martin.⁴

The following text is a reprint *literatim et verbatim* except for the following: (1) parallel sloping lines marking the division into syllables to fit the music are omitted in the second and third lines; (2) the words "abgsang" opposite the sixth line, "Repetier den ganzen Stollen" following the ninth line, and "2" in a square followed by "Der" at the end of the first stanza are omitted.

³ L. Ettmüller (ed.), *Heinrichs von Meissen des Frauenlobs Leiche* etc. ("Bibliothek der gesammten deutschen National-Litteratur," VIII; Quedlinburg 1843), pp. xii (No. 5), xvii; K. Bartsch (ed.), *Meisterlieder der Colmarer Handschrift* ("Bibliothek des litterarischen Vereins," LXVIII; Stuttgart 1862), p. 173 No. 16; G. Roethe (ed.), *Die Gedichte Reinmars von Zweter* (Leipzig 1887), p. 124, n. 161; A. L. Mayer (ed.), *Die Meisterlieder des Hans Folz* ("Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters," XII; Berlin 1908), p. 404 No. 13; E. Ricklinger, *Studien zur Tierfabel von Hans Sachs* (Diss.; Munich 1909), pp. 46-47. For the musical accompaniment see P. Runge, *Die Sangesweisen der Colmarer Handschrift* (Leipzig 1896), pp. 90-91 No. 38; G. Münzer (ed.), *Das Singebuch des Adam Puschman* (Leipzig ca. 1906), p. 15. The "Grundweise" ascribed to Barthel Regenbogen in the Colmar manuscript is entirely different and is, moreover, an error. It is properly the "kurzer Ton" of Barthel Regenbogen; see Bartsch, p. 178.

⁴ A. de Cock, *Volkskunde*. XIX (1907), 198-200.

In der Grundweisz . . / . Frawenlobs
Was zu eim schönen Hausz gehöre.

Zur Zeit als Martin von Rosz das land flandren
Verwüstet mit einandern
Vnd Antorff belegert Kam zu im nausz
Ein Hispanier wonhafft in der state
vor diser der selb hate
So gar ein vber Köstliches lust hausz
Darmit hinfürt
Nicht verwüst würt
Das lust hausz sein
Brandschatzt ers vmb ein grosse Suma gelte
vnd als der vor gemelte
von Rosz darnach wurde gefürt darein

2

Der Spanier fragt den von Rosz on grause
Wie im gfiel dises hause
Dann Da er west das er Zum lust etwas
oder Zum Pracht etwas versaumet hete
So wolt ers (wie er rete)
Doppelt erstatten / darauff sagt fürbas
Martin von Rosz
Des lusthauses grosz
hab ich mein tag
disem gleich, oder schöner nie gesehen
Doch musz ich der verjehen
Das im noch das fürnomste fehlt ich sag

3

Ein Ehrlich Redlichen Wirt solt es haben
desz namen oder gaben
du Schelm nicht wert bist Zu tragen ich sag
Het ich die Schatzung nicht von dir Empfangen
Du soltest gar bald hangen
Vor dem hausz vmb dein Vnthat noch denn tag
Vnd das genent
hausz solt verbrent
Werden mit Dir
Darmit dein gedechnus würd gedilgt ause
Nichts Ziert besser Ein Hause
Dann ein Redlicher Wirt gelaubet mir
.

Anno 1600 hdj 18 Nouember / D. Benedict. von Watt.

ARCHER TAYLOR

RECENT WORKS ON PROSE FICTION BEFORE 1800

What was the nature of prose fiction in its early state, before it was recorded in writing? For what various purposes was it then composed? What consequently different genres resulted? Is it possible to answer such questions by critically examining the stories that appear in ancient literatures,—Egyptian, Chinese, Hebraic, Greek, etc.? Except for the researches of Mr. and Mrs. H. M. Chadwick, as yet unfinished, to which I called attention in my last survey,¹ little work has hitherto been done on these basic problems. The Professor of Classics at King's College, J. A. K. Thomson, in his *Art of the Logos*, makes an ingenious contribution towards their solution by studying Herodotus, master-recorder of oral tales (λόγοι) current in Egypt and Greece in the fifth century B. C. A tale must, obviously, fall into one of three possible classes: it may be true, it may be intentionally invented, or it may be unintentionally fictitious. To the second class, which includes the Fable, Thomson gives little attention; his main quarry is the elusive and mysterious third, "unconscious fiction," in which he finds Herodotus to abound. He subdivides this class into three genres: (1) Myth (of religion), (2) Legend (of history), and (3) Märchen (of ordinary life); and of each he gives examples in translation. Orally transmitted Myths or Sacred Stories were kept as secrets among devotees, and Herodotus does not intend to record any; but unwittingly he relates a few of them, whose religious nature he did not perceive. The Logoi, products of an age when human life was overladen with fear and pain, are predominantly tragic in spirit, yet not without admiration for those who gallantly combat man's sad destiny. They have both the defects and the merits of tales that were to be orally addressed to the populace: on the one hand, they are full of credulity, wishful thinking, and shallow motivation; on the other, they are clear, vivid, and not impeded in their action with unnecessary description or psychological analysis.

Martin Dibelius' *From Tradition to Gospel*, now translated into English, is a theological treatise; but he provides us with relevant matter because his favorite method is that of "Formgeschichte," i. e., literary analysis of the various kinds of biblical narrative. Surveying a large body of literature, not only biblical, but also Rabbinic and Greek, he finds that the oral and written stories current in Palestine in the first century A. D. were chiefly these: (1) the Paradigm, the short story told to make a point, (2) the Legend (which may or may not be fictitious), told in praise of a

¹ *MLN.*, XLIX, 524.

saintly person; and (3) the Tale ("Novella"), told primarily for its own sake. In other words the predominant purpose might be moral, or religious, or aesthetic; and the literary traits of the different genres would vary accordingly. Whether these attempts by the Chadwicks, by Thomson, and by Dibelius, to classify early prose fictions can be harmonized with one another, is a question which cannot be answered until *The Growth of Literature* has been completed; but the outlook at present seems favorable.

A. W. Wade-Evans' *Welsh Christian Origins* attempts to prove in a rather unconvincing way, that "Badonicus," who flourished c. 708, concocted a fictitious addition to Gildas' *De Excidio*. With that slight exception, the only noteworthy contributions concerning the medieval period are editions or studies of Legends. Angelo S. Rappaport compiles *Medieval Legends of Christ* (including that of The Wandering Jew); and Frances M. Mack edits for the EETS. two versions of the exceptionally colorful and popular *Seinte Marherete*. C. A. Williams' *German Legends of the Hairy Anchorite* includes an edition of the legend of St. Chrysostom, which Luther denounced as fictitious and which (mistakenly) he charged Rome with considering authentic. The influence of the Legend of Pope Gregory is shown by G. P. Faust in his *Sir Degare*, and that of the Legend of St. Nicholas by O. E. Albrecht in *Four Latin Plays of St. Nicholas*. The danger of misjudging pious fictions to be true history is illustrated by W. Douglas Simpson's *Celtic Church in Scotland*, which on the archeological side is a learned and curious volume, but which bases its historical thesis upon the assumption that Ailred's Legend of St. Ninian, composed centuries after the alleged events, and commonly recognized by scholars as fictitious, may be relied upon. Shane Leslie's *Script of Jonathan Swift* includes a delightfully appreciative discussion of the Legend of St. Patrick's Purgatory.

SIXTEENTH CENTURY Rudolph Kapp's *Heilige und Heiligenlegenden in England (1500-1700)*, only the first volume of which has as yet appeared, is of distinct importance. Challenging the common assumption that the rise of Humanism and Protestantism reduced the Legends to insignificance, he raises these questions: Was English Protestantism unqualifiedly hostile to them? Did they really disappear; and, if not, how, and where, and under what conditions, did they survive? Were the old legends modified in the new era? Were new ones composed? Kapp's answers to such questions rest upon an examination of some 30,000 books and manuscripts. He admits that most of the Humanists despised the legends as contemptible *fabulae*, that the seventeenth century rationalists (e. g., Hobbes) attacked them as dangerous lies, and

that for their full rehabilitation the saints had to abide the coming of the Romantics. He likewise admits that under Renaissance influences certain *classes* of readers lost interest in the legends; but he contends, and, in my judgment, convincingly proves that among other classes (especially among women and among the common people) the interest in them grew intense. While the cult of some of the Roman saints declined, that of St. George (under whose banner "Protestant" England vanquished Catholic Spain and France) waxed greater and greater. Even when the government forbade the publication of legends, their substance or spirit survived in disguised forms, in Malory, Mandeville, the *Seven Sages*, *Gesta Romanorum*, *Robert the Devil*, *Guy of Warwick*, etc. They survived because they satisfied the constant craving for sustenance of faith, for credibility in the marvelous, and for hero-worship. Kapp's investigation of the influence of the legends upon secular Elizabethan literature might, as he himself says, have been extended much farther, (*e. g.* into Deloney); but he has done more than enough to give the final blow to the old theory that medieval fiction had no influence upon modern.

The Cambridge University Press has published the first volume of the second edition of W. F. Smith's translation of Rabelais, which is particularly valuable because of its full annotations. The so-called "new introduction" cannot be of later date than 1919, when Mr. Smith died; and one regrets that it was not brought abreast of later scholarship.—F. E. Budd (*RES.*, Oct.) shows that the oft-cited passage in *King Lear* does not prove that Shakspeare knew Rabelais.—Andrée Bruel's Wellesley lectures, *Romans Français du Moyen Age*, includes accounts of *Les Quinze Joyes de Mariage* and *Jehan de Saintré*, but has nothing new on those subjects.—The Golden Cockerel Press produces a handsome limited edition of Adlington's translation of Apuleius' *Cupid and Psyche*.—René Pruvost (*RES.*, Jan. 1934) proves that three of Turberville's *Tragical Tales* derive from an Italian version of Pero Mexia's *Silva*.

1935, the year of the canonization of Sir Thomas More, produced two books of lasting importance to students of the author of *Utopia*. One was R. W. Chambers' biography of More, which is a perfect illustration of Coleridge's doctrine that the way to truth lies through a reconciliation of apparent opposites. More's apparent vacillation between England and Rome, between rationalism and authority, between communism and capitalism, is here successfully explained. Throughout his life More saw that order was better than license, that nationalism was better than civil discord; but even higher than nationalism he set international peace; and even higher than the need for authority he set the right of freedom of

speech, of conscience, and of worship. He was "the King's good servant, but God's first." This Anglican interpretation, is, so far as the *Utopia* is concerned, in essential harmony with that of Christopher Hollis, a Roman Catholic, whose *Sir Thomas More* maintains that the *Utopia* was not intended by its author to describe the perfectly ideal state of society, but merely that partly admirable state which man might attain to by the feeble light of mere reason,—"a society which has risen as high as it would be possible for a society to rise which was hampered by no natural or accidental disadvantages, but whose members had only their unaided reasons to lead them to truth."

M. S. Goldman's *Sir Philip Sidney and the Arcadia*, besides fortifying with a plenitude of new biographical and literary evidence Greenlaw's interpretation of the *Arcadia* as a sincere expression of a virile and magnanimous spirit, gives that interpretation an English background by demonstrating the influence upon Sidney of Malory's *Morte d'Arthur*. As was intimated above, the building of such bridges between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance is a great aid to historical truth. The best service of K. O. Myrick's *Sir Philip Sidney as a Literary Craftsman* is to show the close harmony between Sidney's literary theories in *The Defense of Poesie* and his practices in the *Arcadia*. But this is incidental to the main contention of his "essay of reinterpretation," viz. that the key to Sidney lies in an understanding of "that urbane quality which Castiglione called *sprezzatura*," "a certain dash and easy grace which conceals the seriousness of his purposes." Myrick's essay is marred by his failure to acknowledge that Goldman's monograph is the weightiest proof of that seriousness. To give due credit to one's contemporaries and rivals is even more seemly than to give it to the elders who sit in the seats of the mighty.

A handsomely printed and illustrated volume, *The Fool: His Social and Literary History* by Enid Welsford of Newnham College, sheds new light upon the *Facetiae* of Poggio, the *Novelle* of Sacchetti and Bandello, and such popular tales as *Solomon and Marcolfus*, *Kalenberg*, and *Till Eulenspiegel*; because it discusses them in relation with the actual history of professional buffoons and court-fools. After reading Miss Welsford's book, one is likely to change one's former impression that the jest-books are merely vulgar and silly jocosities, and to recognize them as realistic reflections of the social habits and the mental and moral temper of their times. The purpose of Louis B. Wright's *Middle Class Culture in Elizabethan England* is "to describe the intellectual background and interests of the literate common people." Mr. Wright justly protests that Miss Vida Scudder and others have exaggerated the

aristocratic character of Elizabethan literature. He proves that during that period there was a large increase of readers among the middle class, especially among women; and that authors, in composing new works and in revising old ones, adapted them to the limited knowledge and crude tastes of this new public. Mr. Wright does not idealize the bourgeoisie; at times, indeed, as in his remarks on its faith in education (p. 80), he seems unfairly contemptuous towards it. But he has paid the plain people the compliment of reading nearly everything they read,—most of it to ordinary literary historians insufferably dull, and therefore by them ignored. He has read and describes Elizabethan revisions of medieval romances such as an atrocious adaptation of Malory “with the popish utterances expurgated,” and aesthetically degraded versions of *Amadis*, *Palmerin*, the *Mirror of Knighthood*, etc. He furnishes abundant evidence which might be used to refute Mrs. Q. D. Leavis, whose *Fiction and the Reading Public* (1932) exalted the level of Elizabethan intelligence and taste and maintained that shallowness and vulgarity in prose fiction did not arise until the nineteenth century.²

SEVENTEENTH CENTURY The first English translation (1620) of Boccaccio's *Decameron* is reprinted by Blackwell in a magnificent limited edition, adorned with the woodcuts of the Venetian edition of 1492. Giuseppe Petronio's *Il Decamerone: Saggio Critico* raises the question: What to Boccaccio was the most important thing in human life?, and answers: “saviezza,”—a quality of mind not as low as cunning but not as high as wisdom. In a subtle and convincing way he shows that the characters in the *Decameron* succeed or fail according whether or not they possess “saviezza,” which, though not from an ethical point of view an admirable trait, human experience shows to be essential for self-preservation in the kind of world in which, like it or not, we find ourselves. In reading Signor Petronio's analysis of this kind of sagacity, it strikes me that his words might, with little change, be applicable to another great piece of prose fiction,—Le Sage's *Gil Blas*.—To the Shakespeare Association Facsimiles has been added *The Life and Death of Gamaliel Ratsey*.

W. Y. Tindall's *John Bunyan: Mechanick Preacher* (Columbia University thesis) purposes “to show that Bunyan was a typical mechanick preacher [one who worked with his hands for a living], and that his writings owe their nature both to the social, economic, and sectarian condition of their author and to the literary conventions of a numerous company of mechanicks.” If for the words “owe their nature,” we substitute “owe much of their nature,” Mr. Tindall may be credited with having achieved his objectives.

² See my review, *MLN.*, XLVIII, 370.

This might easily have been an exceedingly dull thesis, for many of the writings which he describes are of the dreariest kind; but it is quite the contrary, for he has a delightfully nimble and witty style. It seems regrettable, however, that in this academic dissertation the author should have been permitted to display continually a flippant and sarcastic attitude towards faith and piety. Throughout he jeers at those who believed that they were possessed by the Holy Spirit: "Concerning the favorite residence of the Holy Spirit, we may accept the assurances of His hosts" (p. 190). Insistently he mocks Bunyan's pretensions that his works were inspired from on high:

That the Spirit maintained a residence within John Bunyan we may allow for the encouragement of piety and for want of contrary evidence; but that the literary work of this favored saint owed its form and substance to his ghostly tenant we must decline to believe. . . . The traditional character of his work would suggest the Holy Spirit's unoriginality; but reason recoils from this dangerous and ignoble inference (p. 209).

In substance, this is true; in manner, it is contemptible.

Drawing upon the narratives of the actual experiences of Bunyan's fellow-itinerants, and upon the literature of sectarian controversy, Mr. Tindall establishes the indebtedness of Bunyan to both of those sources in *Pilgrim's Progress*. He stresses its autobiographical elements,—the similarity of Christian and Evangelist to the young Bunyan, and of Greatheart to the older; and the resemblance of By-Ends to his latitudinarian enemies in general, and to his opponent, Edward Fowler, in particular. An annotated edition of *Pilgrim's Progress*, embodying the results of the late Dr. Golder's studies, of Mr. G. B. Harrison's, and of Mr. Tindall's, is much to be desired. Mr. *Badman* he finds a combination of three popular types of contemporary narrative: the dialogue on moral problems, the horror-stories that showed forth divine judgments, and the memoirs of rogues and eccentrics; and he adduces many passages in them which anticipate Bunyan's work. But he admits that for the greatest moment of all,—the death-scene of *Badman*,—he can find no source. Will he permit one to cherish the belief that, in at least this instance, Bunyan really was inspired?

EIGHTEENTH CENTURY F. C. Green gives us in *Minuet: A Critical Survey of French and English Literary Ideas in the Eighteenth Century* one of the most important works in this field that have appeared in many years. It is a masterly essay in Comparative Literature in the literal sense of that term; for, although it makes contributions to literary history, and attacks a particular historical dogma, its main purpose, as indicated in its sub-title, is to *compare* French and English drama, poetry, and prose fiction, in order to discover to what extent they are similar or dissimilar

to each other. Accordingly, Mr. Green examines side by side *Manon Lescaut* and *Moll Flanders*; *La Vie de Marianne* and *Pamela*; *Clarissa Harlowe* and *Les Liaisons Dangereuses*;—i. e., groups of novels dealing with similar materials,—to determine whether the methods and the spirit with which those materials were set forth were alike or unlike. It is a method which requires the power of accurate perception of the significant incidents and characters in the novels, and sensitive appreciation of their peculiar tones and atmospheres. Both of these gifts Mr. Green possesses in a high degree,—more highly as to French masterpieces than as to English, but also as to the latter (see his admirable analysis and appraisal of *Clarissa Harlowe*). His style is easy and graceful; and the only discordant notes are in occasional peevish and ill-informed outbursts (which have a colonial ring) against British customs and manners, e. g. the rash generalizations that the English have no sporting instinct (p. 336) and that they are the only people who ever practised social ostracism (p. 404).

Mr. Green maintains that Joseph Texte's brilliant *Rousseau et le Cosmopolitisme*, with its theory that "Richardson changed the destiny of the French novel," has been uncritically accepted and should be overthrown. The French became "acquainted with English novels, . . . but refashioned them to the taste of their nation." A French "translation" of Richardson was usually a Frenchified Richardson. After all, the English are Baconians, empirical, interested in concrete detail and variety; and the French are Cartesian, rational, interested in general truths and unity; and (it is tacitly assumed) "never the twain shall meet." It is therefore not surprising that after comparing the French masterpieces with the English, we should be "led to the irresistible conclusion that the cosmopolitan spirit left no deep or lasting imprint upon the imaginative literature of eighteenth-century France or England." This is a truth which needed to be spoken, but it is what I should like to call a "two-thirds" truth. Texte overstated his case, but so does Mr. Green. The latter is right (1) in denying that to borrow "occasional scenes and characters" is to undergo really literary influences and (2) in maintaining that differences in style, methods of composition, and aesthetic atmosphere, continued to distinguish French from English art. But there is another element in literary works besides materials (experience) and narrative form; and that is the philosophy or the ideas which determine the selection and interpretation of the materials, and sometimes affect the form also. Mr. Green successfully refutes the notion that the French novelists were influenced by the literary fashions of the English; but he pays little or no attention to the contention that they were strongly

influenced by sentimental ideas and ideals (which, incidentally, were anti-Baconian). Eighteenth-century England was teeming with new ideas about the divine; about nature; about human nature, history, and destiny: and the main contention of scholars in Comparative Literature has been that France was deeply influenced by them. That contention Mr. Green does not, and I think cannot, refute.

Numerous translations of English novels are listed in Mary B. and Lawrence M. Price's *Publication of English Literature in Germany in the Eighteenth Century*. Ernest J. Simmons' *English Literature and Culture in Russia* shows that, beginning with *Gulliver's Travels*, nearly every important English novel was translated, often from German or French versions, into Russian; and that some authors, notably Sterne, had a strong influence.—The Amsterdam dissertations of Michelson and of Cardozo are supplemented by H. R. S. Van Der Veen's *Jewish Characters in Eighteenth Century English Fiction and Drama*. He finds that with the exception of a Jewish money-lender in *Count Fathom*, all Jews in the novels of this period are characterized unfavorably. His interpretations of the facts are superficial.

John Campbell Major's *Role of Personal Memoirs in English Biography and Novel* begins with an account of the development of memoirs and pseudo-memoirs in France, discusses their relationship to English memoirs, and traces the history and influence of the latter into the first half of the century. Mr. Major keeps to essentials; and, as he takes us from early memoir-writers such as Sir James Melville and Francis Osborne, through Turner, Ludlow, Clarendon, and Burnet, up to Sir William Temple, the Duchess of Marlborough, and John Hervey, he makes us conscious of a step-by-step progress, and of what each writer contributed thereto. Ultimately the memoir attained literary value because it abandoned the abstractness and dryness of historiography and gradually gave more and more of the significant personal "little facts" of life, the kind of incidents that reveal character, and personal conversations and letters. The memoirs of political and social intrigue, of romantic adventures, and of roguery, served as models to Mrs. Manley, Mrs. Haywood, Mrs. Davys, Prévost, and especially to Defoe. To the last about one-third of the book is devoted. Some of this merely confirms Secord's researches; but new discoveries are made as to Defoe's indebtedness to the Memoirs of Ludlow, and as to Defoe's *History of Charles XII* and *Life of Mrs. Davies*. Dr. Major seems to be unacquainted with two recent German studies in his field, Birnbaum's *Die Memoirs um 1700* and Zeller's *Die Ich-Erzählung*

im englischen Roman,³ reflection upon which might have improved his competent and useful survey.

The first edition of Defoe's *Journal of the Plague Year* that is both legible and textually correct is given us by A. W. Secord, with an admirably scholarly introduction. One of Defoe's chief literary creditors is presented in W. H. Bonner's *Captain William Dampier*, wherein his loans to *Gulliver's Travels* as well as to *Robinson Crusoe* are audited. I suspect that a closer comparison of Dampier and Swift would show even more borrowings than are here revealed. In *RES.* (July and Oct.) Hans W. Häusermann analyzes the ruling ideas of *Robinson Crusoe*,—including a Calvinistic aversion to art-for-art's sake, a strong interest in religion, and an even stronger devotion to human welfare and to commerce. John R. Moore's *Daniel Defoe and Modern Economic Theory* (Ind. Univ. Studies) shows Defoe as a defender of sound fiscal policies and an opponent of the "new dealers" of his day.

A decided improvement upon previously available texts of *Gulliver's Travels* is given by John Hayward in the Nonesuch Press edition (cf. "New Light on Swift," *TLS.*, 10 Jan. 1936). Shane Leslie's *The Script of Swift*, being his Rosenbach lectures at the University of Pennsylvania, contains little that is new, but is most wittily set forth. Mr. Leslie argues that the reason why Swift did not marry Stella lies in his "eminently practical" mentality: he realized that they would have to live in poverty, which neither of them was suited to endure. An amusing curiosity is Coley B. Taylor's *Mark Twain's Marginalia on Thackeray's Swift*. Mark is sometimes termed "The American Jonathan Swift"; but a perusal of these marginalia,—violent invectives against Swift,—proves that he would not have regarded the designation a compliment.—The first scholarly study of Simon Berington's *Gaudentio Di Lucca* (1737), a Utopia too much neglected, is given by L. M. Ellison (*PMLA.*, L., 494), who sets forth its sources and its ideas in contrast with the Utopias of More and other writers.

While France, Germany, and even Russia were rapturously welcoming the English sentimentalists, Rome, as F. J. Schleck reveals (*TLS.*, 25 Apr.), was placing *Pamela* and *A Sentimental Journal* upon its index of Prohibited Books. For good measure and in a spirit of impartiality, it added to the list the *Anti-Pamela*. William M. Sale proves (*TLS.*, 29 Aug.) that Richardson in 1757 carefully revised Miss Anne Meade's letter-novel, *Sir William Harrington, a Description of Modern Life* (1771). The author of *The Brothers* (1753), a novel of the Richardsonian school, is identified by F. G. Black as a Miss Smythies (*TLS.*, 26 Sept.). Heinz Ronté's

* See *MLN.*, XLIX, 529 and 531.

Richardson und Fielding: Geschichte Ihres Ruhm attempts in some two hundred pages to recount the entire history of the criticism of those two authors in detail. Much of this work has been previously done by F. T. Blanchard and others, and I can find nothing new in Ronte except a so-called "literarsoziologischer" methodology which seems to me more pretentious than fruitful. If an Index had been provided to the critics mentioned (there must be nearly a thousand of them), this would have been a useful reference manual.

Mr. Claude E. Jones in the introduction to his edition of Smollett's *Essay on the External Use of Water* gives us the first competent account of Smollett's attitude towards his profession and his fellow-practitioners. In the Parrott Presentation Volume appears G. M. Kahl's *Influence of Shakespeare on Smollett*.—Geoffrey Tillotson (*TLS.*, 29 Aug.) shows that *Rasselas* drew from Pétis de la Croix' *Persian Tales* several elements,—including perhaps its main idea, and probably its general plan, method of narration, and certain details,—but surpassed his predecessor in elevation of tone and in verisimilitude. This is a model, in miniature, of what a source study should be.—An original interpretation of *Candide*, emphasizing its essentially eighteenth-century and anti-romantic qualities, is found in André Maurois' brilliant *Voltaire*.

Among the new editions that I report this year, by far the most valuable is Lewis P. Curtis' *Letters of Laurence Sterne*. Here we have for the first time all the extant authentic letters and no spurious ones, with the valuable addendum of forty contemporaneous letters pertaining to Sterne and his family. The annotations are so full and so learned that the most inquisitive antiquary could not reasonably ask for more. It is unqualifiedly a definitive edition. The carping review of it in *TLS.* (21 Mar.) was ably refuted by Margaret R. B. Shaw (6 June).

Miriam R. Small's *Charlotte Ramsay Lennox* (Yale Univ. Studies) includes, in its chapter on *The Female Quixote*, a description of other eighteenth-century imitations of *Don Quixote*. Both here and in the accounts of Mrs. Lennox's lesser works there is little criticism that rises above the perfunctory and obvious. The main historical conclusion, not a new discovery, is that Mrs. Lennox belonged to the "moral" school of Richardson. The most interesting passages in her novels are the American scenes in *Harriot Stuart* and *Euphemia*; but usually she made the mistake of imitating other writers instead of drawing materials from her personal experiences and observation. The biography of a woman who spent her girlhood in New York and (as the Governor's daughter) in Albany; who in London was befriended by Richardson, Fielding,

and Johnson (he wrote the best chapter in her *Female Quixote*); and who fought the battle of life valiantly but died in poverty; should prove more interesting than her own writings are. But Miss Small fails to bring Mrs. Lennox alive again; she diligently gathers and records the facts, but does not animate them. Her remark in the preface may explain the reason: "I have endeavored to assemble a more complete biography than has before been presented." One "assembles" buttons, and hash, and crowds; but the art of biography is one of imaginative re-creation.

Charles J. Hill's *Literary Career of Richard Graves* (Smith College Studies), like Professor Small's work, was originally a Yale dissertation. Supplementary researches in England enabled Mr. Hill to find eighty unpublished letters of Graves, which disclosed facts of importance both to the biography and to the interpretation of the novels. Mr. Hill proves that some of the incidents and characters in *The Spiritual Quixote* reflect Graves's personal experiences, and that his romantic elopement and marriage are very probably the basis of the episode concerning Mr. Rivers in the sixth book of that satirical novel. He shows that Graves, commonly described as indiscriminantly hostile to Methodism and all its ministers and practices, was personally an insistent preacher and rigorous practiser of temperance; that he had a kindly feeling towards John Wesley; and that it was not Wesley, but the Calvinistic George Whitefield (a college classmate) whose doctrines and manners were the chief point of attack in *The Spiritual Quixote*. Mr. Hill's monograph seems to me a workmanlike and well-balanced performance, with the right proportion of biography, literary analysis, and literary criticism. It arouses one's desire to reread *The Spiritual Quixote*, and makes one feel that the lesser works of Graves ought to be republished.—Sir Samuel H. Scott's *The Exemplary Mr. Day* (Author of "*Sandford and Merton*") is handsomely printed and illustrated, but has no scholarly value, being merely an intelligent and graceful retelling of an oft-told tale.

Warren Hunting Smith's *Architecture in English Fiction* is mainly concerned with the second half of the eighteenth century. In the first half of that century the fashionable new architecture was of what we now call the "Georgian" type; and the remains of medieval, or "Gothic," dwellings and cathedrals were despised. In the second half of the century there arose an increasing interest in medieval architecture;—because of its historical associations, its picturesqueness, its mysteriousness, its sublimity, and its evocation of the pleasures of melancholy. One result was the attempt to imitate medieval architecture,—e. g. Walpole's Strawberry Hill, wherein the chief objective was the reproduction of medieval ornament;

and Beckford's castle, which attempted to reproduce medieval sublimity by means of height, and medieval grandeur by massiveness. Unfortunately these imitators overlooked one of the intrinsic merits of Gothic architecture,—its structural soundness. Mr. Smith shows that a principal cause of the new architectural craze was the increasing amount of description of castles, cathedrals, etc. in the novels, especially, from 1770 onwards, of Mrs. Radcliffe, Sophia Lee, Regina Roche, and Charlotte Smith. After 1794 there was such "a deluge of castles and abbeys" that Mr. Smith foregoes an attempt to describe them. Prior to that year, however, I think he has overlooked only one pertinent instance, viz. in *The Spiritual Quixote*, iv, Chapter v, where Mr. Townsend, the irate antiquary, inveighs against the fad of "building a ruin" to adorn one's landscape.

This dissertation is more than a diligent compilation of facts. Mr. Smith has evidently pondered their significance, and in his conclusion arrives at generalizations of real cogency and value. Since "housing is an important fact in human existence," he thinks it legitimate that novelists should give it a place in their works,—but only in an amount "commensurate with the actual influence of architecture upon life." The late eighteenth-century novelists went to an excess. Their "literary intrusion into architecture subjected the art of building to the caprices of fashion." It made them yearn for buildings whose proper character they did not fully understand. The consequences were bad on both sides. It disgraced landscapes with monstrosities like Strawberry Hill, and burdened romances with tedious descriptions, thus "concentrating a novelist's attention upon inanimate objects rather than upon human life." "It is just as bad to make literature draw a floor plan as it is to make architecture tell a story."—A useful supplement to Mr. Smith's study of Walpole is W. S. Lewis' "The Genesis of Strawberry Hill" in *Metropolitan Museum Studies*, v.⁴

ERNEST BERNBAUM

University of Illinois

⁴ There is opportunity for much fruitful research in this field. Another study of the same type is Josef Hartmann's *Architektur in den Romanen Hardy's*.

REVIEWS

The Fortunes of Montaigne, a history of the Essays in France, 1580-1669. By ALAN M. BOASE. London: Methuen, 1935. Pp. xl + 462.

The title of Mr. Boase's book is sufficient indication of its purpose and scope. It does not, however, do justice to the detail of the work which includes not only the relation of the various authors studied to Montaigne but frequently a concise outline of their general philosophical position. On the whole it may be said that the task has been done well enough to constitute a definitive study of the problem involved. Apparently all authors who may have been influenced by Montaigne have been treated, as well as those who contributed to his fortunes by their adverse criticism of his ideas.

The results of the study corroborate what, one might imagine, was already known, namely, that Montaigne's prestige did not seriously suffer until the Cartesian critique of some of his ideas was developed and spread about by Port Royal. One gathers from Mr. Boase's Introduction that the most influential doctrine of Montaigne was what he calls his *fidéisme*, a term which most historians reserve, I believe, for certain doctrines of the early nineteenth century but which can be well applied to any theory of the supremacy of faith to reason in matters of religion. The *fidéisme* of Montaigne was, according to Mr. Boase, the root of Montaigne's scepticism, since it could best be substantiated by a demonstration of the weakness of reason. This was not, of course, the case in the nineteenth century; Bautain was far from being a sceptic in matters of science or common sense and indeed if reason and faith are to have two entirely different realms, one needs only to prove that reason is incompetent in those fields which one wishes to reserve for faith, not in all fields. The combination of scepticism and *fidéisme* nevertheless is to be found in the *Essays* and ran through many of the writings of the seventeenth century. That certainly cannot be denied, whatever the argument.

The opposition to Montaigne, continuing Mr. Boase's exposition, arose from the rationalists, i. e., the Cartesians, in spite of their acceptance of certain of their opponent's ideas. Descartes had been able to show what he thought were good reasons for believing in the existence of God and his reasons undoubtedly appealed to a large number of people in seventeenth century France. If his reasons were sound, one could be a Christian without being a *fidéiste* and though the Cartesian point of view was rejected by the

Church, yet it won an important place for itself in the annals of Christian apologetics. But when one turns to Descartes himself one sees that what he says he objects to in Montaigne is not his *fidéisme* but the supposed immoral consequences of the theory that animals have souls. This appears very clearly at the end of the fifth part of the *Discourse on Method*:

I here entered, in conclusion, upon the subject of the soul at considerable length, because it is of the greatest moment: for after the error of those who deny the existence of God, an error which I think I have already sufficiently refuted, there is none that is more powerful in leading feeble minds astray from the straight path of virtue than the supposition that the soul of the brutes is of the same nature with our own, etc. (Everyman ed.)

There can be no doubt of the object of Descartes's words in this sentence. But what *fidéisme* is involved in it? There were "animalitarians" before *fidéisme* was ever dreamt of nor is there any necessary logical connection between the two points of view.

In spite of these reservations the chapter on Descartes is one of the best in the book and has the excellence of many of the other chapters in recognizing conflicting motives in a single mind, an excellence which is not frequently exhibited in the history of ideas. Descartes was no more nor less of a Cartesian than Plato was of a Platonist, and it is folly to try to explain away or "reconcile" the non-Cartesian elements in his works. Mr. Boase appears to recognize this and thus to avoid a too consistent exposition of his thought. It is, however, regrettable that Montaigne was not treated in the same way. Montaigne was, as everyone knows, deeply read in such authors as Plutarch, Sextus Empiricus, and the Paradoxists. The general humor of such men was to try out odd and amusing opinions and one can understand the point of many of Montaigne's essays more easily if one sets them in that tradition. Even the work of Agrippa von Nettesheim was translated into French as a paradox and one cannot argue from the serious import of an opinion that it was read or written because of that import. Many of the most familiar quotations from Montaigne—this too is common knowledge—are literal translations from his classical sources and were widely circulated saws in late classical and Renaissance times. His animalitarianism, such as it was, was platitudinous by the first century A. D. and the famous *Natura non mater sed noverca* was quoted from "the Ancients" by Philo. If it had not been for Charron's systematizing of the *Essays*, it is doubtful whether anyone would ever have thought of Montaigne as anything other than a shrewd moralist, a sort of literary Diogenes. That is part of the irony of his fortunes and a part which Mr. Boase seems to neglect.

It is the unfortunate task of a reviewer to speak more lengthily of the deficiencies than of the achievements of a book. This re-

view should not close without paying tribute to Mr. Boase's erudition, his industry, and his good sense. Should anyone feel that much of what he has done had already been accomplished by Villey's *Montaigne devant la Postérité*, that feeling may be calmed by the knowledge that Villey apparently was indebted to Mr. Boase for much of his information (*vide* Preface, p. vii). It is only right to invite a reader's attention to this fact, though one would feel more sympathy for Mr. Boase if he did not himself rather contemptuously dismiss an author (p. xxvii, n. 2) whom he was later to utilize down to his very neologisms and that without the slightest acknowledgement (pp. 400 f.).

GEORGE BOAS

The Johns Hopkins University

Jules Lemaître et le Théâtre. Par GERMAINE DURRIÈRE. Paris: Boivin et Cie., 1934. Pp. iii + 320.

L'ouvrage dépasse un peu son titre, sans que l'on songe pourtant à reprocher à l'auteur d'étendre les limites de son sujet. La carrière universitaire de Jules Lemaître, les querelles littéraires, sociales, politiques où il a pris part, les contes et nouvelles qui ont été les essais de thèmes que plus tard il a mûris pour la scène, les tristesses de sa vie privée: tout cela est d'un intérêt indiscutable, mais peut-être pas toujours à propos. Bonne part est faite aussi aux effarouchements qu'a provoqués dans le public un critique impressionniste et friand de nouveauté. Pour le mieux saisir enfin une figure d'homme complexe jusqu'à la contradiction inclusive-ment, Mlle Durrière a sollicité les témoignages de ceux qui ont connu les "multiples personnages qui habitaient en Lemaître." C'est évidemment le titre de l'ouvrage qui a tort.

Au surplus, ce gros livre est court, ou du moins il dit plus de choses qu'il n'est gros, et a vite fait de captiver le lecteur. L'auteur analyse personnalités, milieux, débats, aventures, paradoxes, critique et théâtre avec autant de concision que de délicatesse. Et ce livre conçu dans un sentiment d'admiration n'a rien d'une apologie. Si les tours et les détours de l'esprit de Lemaître sont tracés avec sympathie, ses faiblesses et ses erreurs sont étudiées sans parti pris.

On pourrait peut-être chicaner sur quelques détails; par exemple, l'assertion que Lemaître n'a jamais la moindre gaminerie quand il aborde les tragédies de Racine (68). J'ai cru, pour ma part que certaine "Conférence de M. Francisque Sarcey sur *Athalie*" était une interprétation de "la plus profonde des tragédies politiques" (Lemaître) dont Sarcey n'avait pas été seul à s'amuser. On pourrait se demander si "apologiste de Diderot" est un titre qui

convienne à Joseph Reinach (77). Je ne saisis pas très bien la signification de "critique expérimentale" (134), ni l'utilité de quelques remarques: "Cela n'est-il pas joli?" (115); "... l'Administration n'a guère compris qui était Lemaître, du moins en ses débuts" (3, n. 1). Je relève aussi une ou deux répétitions (8 et 35, 46 et 105), et je m'empresse d'ajouter que si des distractions de ce genre sautent aux yeux, c'est que Mlle D. n'en est pas coutumière.

"Lemaître est quelqu'un sur qui il ne faudrait écrire qu'avec cette encre polychrome dont rêvait Renan pour traduire les mille nuances de la mouvante réalité!" (290) Mais la franchise et le tact, l'enthousiasme et la mesure ont aussi leur magie, et Mlle Durrière a écrit sur le dramaturge, le critique, l'homme que fut Jules Lemaître un livre définitif dont, j'imagine, Lemaître eût goûté l'intelligence.

MAURICE BAUDIN

New York University

The German Legends of the Hairy Anchorite. By CHARLES ALLYN WILLIAMS. ("University of Illinois Bulletin," XXXII, No. 39 = "Illinois Studies in Language and Literature," XVIII, Nos. 1-2; Urbana, Illinois, 1935.) Pp. 140 and 5 plates.

This essay brings to a close Williams's studies in the legend of St. John Chrysostomos. His interest in the legend was awakened by the discovery of a version in a volume of manuscript *Meisterlieder* and it has led to an ample interpretation of the story told by the old *Meistersinger*. Williams points out the similarities between a myth told of a Babylonian god of fertility and a Christian legend of a saint. The gap between the two is wide, and he is entirely aware of that fact. He does not pursue the later history of the legend and has no occasion to deal more than incidentally with the Romance texts. Whimsically I add that he might have mentioned the French use of St. Jean Bouche d'or as a name for a braggart (see J. M. Adrião, *Revista lusitana*, XXXII [1934], 48). This volume, the last of three studies in the legends, contains important editions of the anonymous *Meisterlied* and—edited by Louis Allen—two Old French versions of *La Vie de Saint Jehan Paulus* (= pelu)." Professor Williams calls my attention to a new version of the *Meisterlied* in the fifteenth-century MS Germ. 4° 1587 foll. 262^r sqq. in the State Library at Berlin; H. Degering, *Kurzes Verzeichnis der germanischen Handschriften der preussischen Staatsbibliothek*, II, 295. Although the new version is complete (the version printed by Williams is not), it does not otherwise give as good a text as the printed version. Unfortunately

Williams did not learn of it in time to use the variant readings. We may hope that Williams will print a collation of the new version. This new version settles Wesselski's unfounded doubts about the age of the *Meisterlied* (see *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, LVI [1935], coll. 2039-40) and fixes the date of the *Meisterlied* before 1500. Furthermore, Wesselski protests at length against seeking a connection between Enkidu of the Gilgamesh-epic and St. John Chrysostomos. One will grant readily enough that the domination of demons and gods of fertility and their rituals has become as tiresome in the interpretation of popular materials as the sun-hero of blessed memory. Indeed, the demon of fertility is in a fair way to become a jack-of-all-trades. The ritual of fertility-cults now explains the Holy Grail as well as the Witches' Sabbath. One can neither accept nor reject these things *en masse*. Some of these explanations are more plausible than others, and some, indeed, are surely correct. Since the hero of this legend is in some versions St. Jean le *Paulu* (i. e. 'the hairy'), I cannot cast aside the mention of hairiness as an incidental detail of no great importance. After all, the resemblances between Enkidu and St. John Chrysostomos are curious and need some explanation. Williams prints his texts carefully. He has suggested, as I have pointed out elsewhere (*Germanic Review* [1936]), several matters calling for further investigation. All in all, a good book attractively got up.

ARCHER TAYLOR

The University of Chicago

Deutscher Sprachatlas, fortgesetzt von WALTHER MITZKA und BERNHARD MARTIN. 7. Lieferung. Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1934.

The seventh number of the *Sprachatlas* has appeared after an interim of two years. During this time the editor, Ferdinand Wrede, under whose able guidance the *Deutscher Sprachatlas* became a real instrument for the scientific study of the German dialects, was all too soon called from his earthly labors. Here is not the place to dwell upon Wrede's services in behalf of dialect study, but if there ever was an individual whose name was synonymous with his activities, it certainly was Wrede's. One cannot think of 'Mundartenforschung' in the modern sense of the word without thinking of Wrede, no matter from what angle we approach the subject.

This number of the *Sprachatlas* concerns itself with the forms and distribution of the words *unserm* in sentence 26 ('Hinter unserm Hause stehen drei schöne Apfelbäumchen mit roten Äpfel-

chen'.) and *Wiese* in sentence 40 ('Ich bin mit den Leuten da hinten über die Wiese ins Korn gefahren'). It also contains two *Ergänzungskarten* E and F, which deal with supplements to maps 21 (accusative *euch* in sentence 31); 22 (*sei* in sentence 17); 23 (*fest* in sentence 24); 24 (*Hause* in sentence 26); 25 (*dich* in sentence 14); 26 (synonyms for *Dienstag* in South Germany, as well as two lists of synonyms for *krumm* and *Apfelbäumchen* in sentence 26).

It is greatly to be regretted that the so-called 'Paus- or Pergaminblätter' have been discontinued for reasons of economy. They may, however, be got from the publisher if desired. Whether an extra charge is to be made for them is not stated. Also to economic reasons is to be attributed no doubt the fact that the 'Text' is no longer separately bound but simply folded and sent along in the folder which contains the maps. There is otherwise no change in the character of the work and none, I believe, is contemplated, for Wrede had already cared for all the manifold details and established a well-nigh ideal model for such publications.

In conclusion I wish to congratulate Dr. Walther Mitzka on his appointment as Wrede's successor, and wish him all success and may he meet with no untoward circumstances which could in any way interfere with the continuation of the undertaking.

EDWARD H. SEHRT

George Washington University

An Indiscretion in the Life of an Heiress (Hardy's "Lost Novel").

By THOMAS HARDY. Edited by CARL J. WEBER. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1935. Pp. viii + 146. \$2.00.

Tess of the D'Urbervilles. By THOMAS HARDY. Edited with notes by CARL J. WEBER. New York: Harpers, 1935.

Colby Notes on "Far From the Madding Crowd." Edited by CARL J. WEBER. Waterville, Maine, 1935.

An Indiscretion in the Life of an Heiress is a novelette of Hardy's which appeared in 1878 in *The New Quarterly Magazine*, and is now first printed in America and in book form. It is obviously a very early work of Hardy's, thin, stiff and conventional in conception and execution. Its great interest to book-lovers lies in the fact that it probably constitutes a slightly revised form of Hardy's first novel, *The Poor Man and the Lady*. The identification is here made and established with high plausibility by Professor Carl J. Weber, an expert in Hardiana. Mr. Weber lists all the items known about the contents and history of Hardy's lost novel—including the criticisms passed on it by Alexander Macmillan and

George Meredith, and Hardy's own statement that, when moving in 1878, he "got rid" of the manuscript. His theory is that Hardy did not destroy the manuscript but instead "dismembered" it. The satirical and "socialistic" parts, which had been objected to by his critics, he cut out. The parts which had been most highly praised—Dorset scenes, a Christmas eve party at a tranter's house—he included in his novel, *Under the Greenwood Tree*. Most of the rest—including the main body of the story—was thriftily reworked and disposed of to a magazine.

A cultivated country youth is in love with an heiress, but is scorned (by her father) for his poverty and lowly birth. He goes to London and makes good. He renews his acquaintance with the rich girl at a concert, and their secret marriage leads to the lady's death. In the earlier version, the hero was an architect who won a prize. Here he is an author who establishes himself with a successful novel. In either case the youthful Hardy was taking himself for a model, and—except for the heiress—the autobiographical flavor is unmistakable.

A part of the editor's fun was identifying the quotations prefixed to the several chapters. He has noted three quotations from Shakespeare, two from Browning, and one each from Shelley, Thackeray, Waller and the Bible. The following he missed: Part I, Chap. 2, Browning's "The Flight of the Duchess"; I 4, Shakespeare's Sonnet 111; I 6, Byron's "The Corsair"; II 3, Shelley's "When the Lamp Is Shattered." We are made to realize how conscientiously the ambitious young writer was going through his favorites among the English classics.

A large amount of interesting Hardiana has been collected by Professor Weber in his notes to Harpers' editions of *Tess* and *Far from the Madding Crowd* in their Modern Classics series. The notes to *Tess* are included in the volume itself; those to *The Madding Crowd* make up a pamphlet supplementary to the Harpers volume. In both cases the notes are extremely miscellaneous, and include matter suitable for use only in elementary classes and often better left to dictionaries and other books of reference. Mr. Weber has been hampered by the tradition of annotated classics for school children. The most valuable features are matter topographical and dialectal, time-schemes of the carefully-prepared chronology of events, reference to significant alterations from the serial form of the novels, citation of the (often perverse) critical comment by contemporary reviewers and by more distinguished authors like George Moore, Frank Harris, Henry James and George Meredith. These notes represent a large amount of devoted research. Hardy may now be studied line-by-line like Chaucer and Shakespeare. May our teachers be inspired to use this apparatus with more discretion than pedantry!

JOSEPH WARREN BEACH

University of Minnesota

Milton's Use of Du Bartas. By GEORGE COFFIN TAYLOR. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1934. Pp. 129.

Milton's "De Doctrina Christiana." By ARTHUR SEWELL. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934. (Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association, XIX, 40-66.).

Milton's Anschauungen von Staat, Kirch, Toleranz. Von GERTRUD HARDELAND. Halle: Niemeyer, 1934. Pp. 175.

Further Studies Concerning the Origin of "Paradise Lost." By H. MUTSCHMANN. Dorpat, Esthonia: 1934. Pp. 56.

Milton's Blindness. By ELEANOR GERTRUDE BROWN. New York: Columbia University Press, 1934. Pp. 167.

Mr. Taylor has grossly exaggerated his statement of his case. There are certainly many similarities between Milton and Du Bartas, since both write on themes in which a basis of Christianity, humanism and occultism is common to practically all writers of the XVIth and XVIIth centuries. Verbal coincidences mean very little. The line "Invisible, immortal, infinite" which Mr. Taylor makes much of because it is found in Milton and in Sylvester is nothing but a platitude which anyone might have used: a man saying "all is well that ends well" is not necessarily copying a friend of his who said it ten years before. In order to show genuine similarity of ideas between two writers, one has to study not this or that particular statement, even if verbally identical in both, but the value given to ideas or words by their place in general schemes of thought. "Matter essentially good" may mean several very different things: e. g. (1) that God created matter good, although the Fall made it evil; (2) that matter remained good even after the Fall, but that man misuses it; (3) that matter is a divine substance. Similarly, every one agrees that Light is the first of created things: that may be said by a Trinitarian, by an Arian, by a materialist. Reversely, Du Bartas cannot be a witness as to what Milton meant by "uncircumscribed myself retire": one has to fit the statement into a general scheme to understand it at all; and Du Bartas' scheme is essentially different from Milton's.

In short, this very painstaking study has, in my opinion, been stultified by a lack of sound historical method: much as though one were to say that Cardinal Newman derived all his ideas from Bossuet, but that they are also found in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. (The *Mirror* and *Hexaemeral* literatures). Had Mr. Taylor studied first the common ground and then the differences between Du Bartas and Milton, his work might have been of great value, and he would have achieved one of his aims: to give greater importance to Du Bartas—a very legitimate aim.

Mr. Arthur Sewell holds that there are contradictions between

the *De Doctrina* and *Paradise Lost*. I find myself unable to agree. His two main points seem to me to be wrong: he believes that Bk. III, 245 ff. shows Milton hesitating as to a possible double death of Christ, whereas in the *T. C. D.* the whole of Christ dies. But X. 780 ff. uses the same language about Adam, and yet makes it clear that the whole of man dies; the mortalist arguments of the 1655 pamphlet and of the *T. C. D.* are already there. The second point is that there are traces of Trinitarianism in Bk. III and none in the *T. C. D.* But I fail to see any Trinitarianism in Bk. III, where the Son is called (383)

of all Creation first
Begotten Son, Divine Similitude.

Even the line, "Bright effluence of bright essence increate," which Sewell quotes, goes against his thesis, since metaphysically the *effluence* must rank below the *essence*.

Fraülein Hardeland gives a rather conservative study of Milton's political creed and tries to prove that there is much Calvinism about him. She minimises the fact that Calvinistic predestination and Miltonic liberty do not go at all well together. But her criticism of her opponents is moderate and sensible, and her knowledge of Milton is precise and extensive. Only she brings forward but little that is new.

Professor Mutschmann continues his lyrical effusions on Milton—which have made him deservedly famous. One can say that every single sentence he writes is wrong; and yet that the fury of his temperament and the abundance of his learning make his book fascinating although exasperating reading.

Miss Brown will have none of the syphilis theory of Milton's blindness. But she fails, or rather her medical friends fail, to bring any decisive solution. Perhaps, as she says, we have not enough data to decide. Her statements seem to me well-balanced and carefully thought out; and I personally accept her chastisement of me with a smile. It is really quite indifferent to me whether Milton suffered from hereditary syphilis or not. But I note that in Europe most of my medical friends incline to the view that there is a relationship between syphilis and genius. Let the doctors fight it out.

DENIS SAURAT

King's College, London

The Neo-Classic Theory of Tragedy in England during the Eighteenth Century. By CLARENCE C. GREEN. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934. Pp. x + 245. \$2.50. (Harvard Studies in English, XI.)

Dr. Green's study is an ambitious attempt to treat a large subject in small compass. It brings together a widely culled

assortment of interesting materials, and treats them with an active and inquiring mind. The results are necessarily tentative, however, and perhaps only the specialist will be able to view the evidence in its proper perspective.

One weakness of the work is that it tends to present a "neo-classical" viewpoint as though the viewpoint stood unchanged throughout the period. In the discussion of taste (pp. 75-9), for example, Dr. Green fails to show the important changes in the conception of that faculty which occurred about the middle of the century (see my article in *PMLA* for June, 1934). Similarly, he outlines (pp. 74-5) a prevailing idea that the rules were inductively derived, but fails to point out that this idea did not attain much prominence until about 1750.

Certain of Dr. Green's generalizations are hasty and unsound. For example, he says (p. 107) that in 18th-century usage fancy—and, by indiscrimination, imagination—were likely to be regarded as trivial. Because critics held that imagination must be controlled by reason, we cannot conclude that they considered it trivial. It should be recalled that Dryden, in the preface to *An Evening's Love*, remarked, "Judgment, indeed, is necessary in [the poet]; but 'tis fancy that gives the life-touches, and the secret graces to [a dramatic poem]; especially in serious plays, which depend not much on observation." Even John Dennis observed in the *Characters and Conduct of Sir John Edgar* that no matter how much judgment a man may have, he cannot be a poet unless he possesses imagination; he insisted in the *Advancement and Reformation of Modern Poetry* that strength of imagination was one of two important factors in the greatness of poetry; and he asserted in the *Grounds of Criticism* that sacred poetry, of which he had a particularly high opinion, required great capacity and "a very warm and strong imagination." And from about the middle of the century, as Dr. Green himself later intimates (p. 122), the importance of the imagination came to be more and more heavily stressed.

Perhaps a point should have been made of the effect on critical theory of the popularity of certain tragedies other than Shakespeare's. At any rate, Dr. Green should have recognized specifically the part taken by critics who were actively engaged with dramatic production in breaking down the rules. It is of primary importance that in the first quarter of the century three of the ablest playwrights, Farquhar, Cibber, and Steele, expressed themselves violently in opposition to the rules.

Dr. Green sometimes tends to rely too heavily on isolated quotations, or to consult only a small portion of a critic's work; as a result, an inadequate impression is left of the purpose and import of various eminent critics such as John Dennis and Joseph Warton. Such obvious sources as Steele's *Theatre* are disregarded. Occasionally quotations are misinterpreted; on p. 79 are two

remarks of Gildon's which completely contradict each other, yet both are taken to illustrate a single idea. Dr. Green's book is an interesting start, but a great deal more work needs to be done on his subject.¹

E. N. HOOKER

The Johns Hopkins University

John Florio. The Life of an Italian in Shakespeare's England.

By FRANCES A. YATES. Cambridge: At the University Press;
New York: The Macmillan Company, 1934. Pp. 364. \$5.25.

At last John Florio gets justice. Miss Yates answers some of the most stubborn questions about him and raises a host of new problems, solving many of them and leaving the rest with bearings plainly charted on the seas of uncertainty. Dispassionate about everything except the pursuit of her evidence, she draws an impartial portrait definitely more prepossessing than the braggart, sycophant, and buffoon whom Mr. Arthur Acheson once painted and more convincing than the Comtesse de Longworth-Chambrun's "sensibilité suraiguë, intelligence bornée, coeur plus borné."¹

Miss Yates slays the most scandalous chimaeras which haunt the Florio record, but by relentless tracking through every available archive she involves John in political intrigues and literary quarrels enough to have crushed all but the most 'resolute' spirit. Her first chapter leaves no doubt that he was the son of Michael Angelo Florio, who fled to London in 1550 and became the pastor of the Italian Protestants there. Although "an act of fornication" lost him his pastorate in 1552, he became Italian master to Lady Jane Grey and continued his career as a Protestant apologist, fleeing from England in the Marian persecutions and dying some time between 1566 and 1572 among the Italian expatriates in Soglio, then in Switzerland. To the accidents of his father's exile it appears that John Florio owed his London birth and his education probably entirely outside of Italy.

After such a youth it is not surprising to find a vein of puritanism and of sympathy with free-thinking Italian religious *fuorusciti* running all the way from the *First Fruits* to the selections from Boccacini's *Ragguagli di Parnaso* which Florio chose

¹ Since this review was written, an article has appeared by D. F. Bond, " 'Distrust' of Imagination in English Neo-classicism " (*PQ*, xiv, 54-69), in which the important place of imagination in the literary theory of this period is interestingly described. Mr. Bond's excellent point might be stated even more positively: many writers tended to regard imagination or fancy as the fundamental element in poetry, and judgment simply as the basis of that element of form common to all the arts.

² *Giovanni Florio. Un Apôtre de la Renaissance en Angleterre à l'époque de Shakespeare* (Paris, 1921), p. 36.

to translate in the *New-found Politicke*. That tendency made him the quixotic supporter and friend of his 'olde fellow Nolano,' in whose quarrels with English pundits Miss Yates shows him bearing a hand in the *Second Fruites* and again in the Montaigne prefaces. His loyalty to Giordano Bruno and his puritanism exposed his Italian-English dialogues to the Rabelaisian satire of John Eliot's *Ortho-epia Gallica*. Some of Miss Yates's best detective work is done in her chapter on Eliot and Florio. Still more interesting is the succeeding chapter on "The Dictionary and 'H. S.," for the Shakespeare surmise anent 'H. S.' is finally shattered by irrefragable proof that the initials are those of Hugh Sanford, or Samford, the literary henchman of the Countess of Pembroke. Florio held Sanford responsible for the bad taste which marred the 1593 edition of Sidney's *Arcadia*. From this investigation there emerges the likelihood that Florio himself was the "overseer" employed by Fulke Greville to prepare the *Old Arcadia* for the press. In general, it seems that he had a talent for friendship with the better minds in the world of letters. At one time he was "banded" with Nashe. He seems to have been in alliance with Ben Jonson. If he had a quarrel with Shakespeare, it arose out of his neo-classical dramatic prejudices more definitely than it can be shown to have sprung out of resentment of any personal caricatures in Holofernes or Armado in *Love's Labours Lost*. The last of the great names to be associated with Florio's, if Miss Yates is right in identifying the author of the second part of the *New-found Politicke*, is that of Robert Burton.

If readers carp at this monograph, they are likeliest to object to the professionalism which betrays itself in the treatment of names which have richly deserved oblivion as "well-known"; while the man who englished *The City of God* makes his bow as "one John Healey," knocking here at the portals of Fame as a humble translator of Epictetus. But this price is worth paying for the sleuthing which exposes Florio in correspondence—as friend or teacher or confidential agent or even as political spy—with half the persons, both English and foreign, who mattered in the England of Elizabeth and James I.

MERRITT Y. HUGHES

University of California

Essay on the External Use of Water. By TOBIAS SMOLLETT.
 Edited by CLAUDE E. JONES. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins
 Press, 1935. Pp. 31-82. (Reprinted from Bulletin of the
 Institute of the History of Medicine, III.)

Smollett's *Essay on the External Use of Water* made little stir in its own day, and has since been largely neglected by most of

Smollett's biographers and critics. It is, however, a document which ought to be available, whether to those interested in medical history or to the students of Smollett. Since it is extremely rare (but three copies, according to Mr. Jones, are extant in the United States), to make it more accessible was, in itself, a task worth while. Mr. Jones has added to the value of the reprint, by his Introduction and notes, and also by a frontispiece which is an excellent reproduction of Dance's portrait of Smollett.

The text of the *Essay* is reprinted with a high degree of accuracy. A somewhat hasty collation with the copy in the Yale Library revealed very few errors. For example, "same" is twice printed as "fame" (pp. 52, 70), owing, no doubt, to the modern printer's unfamiliarity with eighteenth century initial "s"; "expansion" appears as "expension" (p. 57). Despite its display of erudition and medical terminology, the *Essay* is, even for the layman, still readable.

In his Introduction, Mr. Jones has gathered together most of the references in Smollett's other writings which reveal his medical career and opinions. This material might have been better organized, and critical comment on the *Essay* itself might have been added. There is one apparent contradiction: Mr. Jones writes, "... he devoted himself exclusively to literature, soon after taking his medical degree in 1750" (p. 32) but later suggests a considerably longer period of practice, "It seems that, after 1762, Smollett's medical practice was of less importance than his literary work" (p. 36). Such a slip, however, is slight in comparison with the convenience of having brought together in the Introduction much material from a wide range of sources.

Mr. Jones, in the notes, gives exact references to the medical works of contemporary and earlier authors quoted by Smollett in the *Essay*. Since the reprint was first made for the Bulletin of the Institute of the History of Medicine, this kind of annotation was the editor's most important duty. The lay reader, however, will look in vain for information about Mr. Cleland, the Bath surgeon in defense of whose proposals Smollett wrote the *Essay*. He will also be unable to satisfy his curiosity about Cleland's anonymous adversary who attacked him, according to Smollett, in a letter full of "abusive low sarcasms, levelled at a lady of distinction, and, indeed, at a whole nation, on her account." If this libeller and Mr. Cleland's distinguished supporter could be identified, more light might be thrown on the obscurity of Smollett's career. In any case, it seems clear that here in the *Essay* is an early example of his resentment at the vilification of the Scotch. Possibly the identification cannot be made, but it is to be hoped that Mr. Jones, who has evident talents for research, will be able to discover the facts.

EDWARD S. NOYES.

Yale University

Edinburgh Essays on Scots Literature. Edited by H. J. C. GRIERSON. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1933. Pp. 185. 5 sh.

This little volume is a welcome indication of the fact that the Universities of Scotland are beginning to pay some attention to the national literature, which they have so long ignored. The apology for this neglect, which Professor Grierson makes in his Preface, may serve as an excuse for the professors (some of whom did more than was required of them), but does not justify the long-continued indifference of the Universities towards this and other subjects of national interest. "The fact is," says Professor Grierson, "that there has been little or no demand." Surely, however, it is the function of universities to be leaders in educational matters, and not merely to supply learning in accordance with a popular demand for it.

The seven lectures included in this volume cover separate authors or types of Scottish literature from the fifteenth century to the present day. H. Harvey Wood writes on Henryson, of whose fables he recently edited a useful and long-forgotten text. W. M. Mackenzie treats of Dunbar, with perhaps a little too much about Chaucer. The only other author selected for separate treatment is John Galt, by W. Kitchin. Galt certainly has his place in Scottish literature, but it will probably be necessary to re-affirm this from time to time to prevent much of his work from being forgotten. In the first of the remaining four lectures, J. D. Westwood deals with 'Scots Theological and Proverbial Literature,' a combination hardly justified by the fact that David Fergusson was both a preacher and a collector of proverbs. Each of the fields would have provided ample material for a separate lecture. 'The Eighteenth Century Revival' by W. Oliver, traces the rise of the new dialect poetry from Watson's collection of 1706, but is mainly an appreciation of Allan Ramsay, both as a collector and as an original writer; it is perhaps an accident that Mr. Oliver nowhere calls him a poet. The two concluding pieces on 'Modern Scots Poetry,' by Ian A. Gordon, and 'Modern Scots Novelists,' by A. Macdonald, are sympathetic but judicious surveys of fields in which much is being attempted and something achieved. In both of these lectures there is a commendable absence of over-enthusiasm as to what has so far been accomplished by the newer writers. On the whole these seven lectures should serve the double purpose of giving a considerable amount of sound information in a clear and interesting manner, and of awaking a desire to read more of the authors and books with which they deal.

W. A. CRAIGIE.

University of Chicago

The Milk of Paradise. By MEYER H. ABRAMS. Harvard Honors Theses in English No. 7. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934. Pp. xi + 86. \$1.25.

Sir Walter Scott. By DOROTHY MARGARET STUART. English Association Pamphlet No. 89. London [and New York]: Oxford University Press, 1934. Pp. 18. \$0.70.

Undercurrents of Influence in English Romantic Poetry. By MARGARET SHERWOOD. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934. Pp. xii-365. \$3.50.

Since *The Milk of Paradise* is an undergraduate honors thesis, scholars might easily make the mistake of assuming that its publication indicated the intellectual promise rather than the accomplishment of its author. It is, however, an essential document of Coleridge criticism, an interpretation of "The Ancient Mariner" which, to this reviewer at least, seems more enlightening than almost any other except that greatest monument of Coleridge studies, *The Road to Xanadu*. The fecundating influence of Mr. Lowes appears through the whole essay; yet the disciple manages to make a most important addition to the master's work.

Mr. Abrams has studied medical and psychological authorities upon opium, "the milk of Paradise" in "Kubla Khan," in order to trace its effects in literature. After skilfully interpreting the chief characteristics of its influence on De Quincey, Crabbe, and Francis Thompson, Mr. Abrams applies the evidence thus gathered to the interpretation of "The Ancient Mariner," with most persuasive effect. If Mr. Lowes is clearly right in refuting Mr. J. M. Robertson, if the poem is too much a work of conscious art to be, like "Kubla Khan," a direct product of opium, yet it furnishes parallel after parallel to the known phenomena of opium dreams; and these can scarcely, after Mr. Abrams' essay, be interpreted except as he suggests. "A framework of plot was constructed expressly to contain the pre-existent fabric of dream phenomena," he says. There is no difficulty in our recognition that the original sources of the imagery have so often been identified by Mr. Lowes: "opium dreams . . . feed upon the fragmentary memories of earlier experiences." The parallels offer convincing evidence that these memories have been transmuted in "the crucible of dreams." We recognize in "The Ancient Mariner," as well as in "Kubla Khan," the strange and sinister beauty of opium.

Dorothy Margaret Stuart's lecture on Scott deals especially with his three novels of seventeenth-century England, his staginess, his debt to Horace Walpole. It does not pretend to a more permanent value than that of a sympathetic and sensitive occasional address.

Miss Sherwood's volume includes appreciative essays on the

eighteenth-century deists, Herder and his influence, Wordsworth's conception of "the unity of all" and "the imaginative will," Keats's imaginative approach to myth, the young Browning, and the adverse criticism of Browning by Santayana. The recurrent themes are the organic unity of life and its evolution toward higher spiritual forms, traced through the several writers in a manner of rather strained eulogy.

THOMAS M. RAYSOR

University of Nebraska

BRIEF MENTION

Victor Hugo During the Second Republic. By ELLIOTT M. GRANT. Northampton: 1935. Pp. v + 68. Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, Vol. xvii, no. 1. In an admirably documented and at the same time clear-cut and concise study, Prof. Grant sets himself to the examination of Hugo's political activities from February, 1848, to December, 1851. His main object is to lend weight to the conclusions of other scholars to the effect that Hugo's political development during this period is marked, if not by consistency, at least by sincerity, evolution, and a genuine interest in the welfare of the masses, and that he was not the unspeakable ingrate and turncoat which such bitterly partisan studies as those of Biré and Lacretelle make him out to have been. In five well-organized and solidly buttressed chapters, G. traces Hugo's progress from his monarchistic liberalism of the last years of the Orléans régime, through his support of the Prince-President, to his complete disillusionment in that worthy and his conversion to radical democracy. In building up his case, G. quotes liberally from the editorial and news columns not only of the Hugo paper, *l'Événement*, founded on August 1, 1848, and of other liberal journals such as *la Démocratie pacifique* and *la Réforme*, but also of the conservative and reactionary periodicals of the day, notably *le Constitutionnel* and *le Journal des Débats*. He studies Hugo's speeches and his votes on the legislation presented to the National Assembly, of which he was a member from June 4, 1848, until its dissolution under the *coup d'état*. His conclusion (p. 67) is that Hugo's record here is one of "considerable naïveté" and "inconsistency" but not one of "gross apostasy, prevarication, or deceit." A valuable contribution is the revelation by G. of the fact that, in their attempt to prove that Hugo was consistently conservative during the first months of the Second Republic, Biré and Lacretelle sometimes—intentionally, it would seem—fail to record votes cast by him on the side of the liberals (*vide* p. 18).

G.'s study is, admittedly, not a whitewashing of Hugo's political career; it is merely a mitigation of the almost unpardonably biased acerbity of Biré and Lacretelle. With the best will in the world, however, one can not but feel that G. has helped Hugo's case only a little. It is with something like sadness that one lays down this story of the political waverings, blunders, and short-sightedness of the great poet during the larger part of the era of the Second Republic; and when one recalls that his record in the period of the July revolution was scarcely more creditable, one is inclined to regret the fact that Hugo should have thought that a bard should don the robe of a statesman and play a rôle in the political arena.

AARON SCHAFFER

The University of Texas

An Index . . . to 'The Elizabethan Stage' and 'William Shakespeare: a study of facts and problems' by Sir Edmund Chambers. Compiled by BEATRICE WHITE. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1934. Pp. viii + 162. \$7.00. The price of this welcome tool is unfortunate; but everyone who can afford to buy it should do so, since it unquestionably facilitates the use of two of the great books of Elizabethan scholarship. "Modern critics are not mentioned and the Index is confined in the main to the sixteenth century."

H. S.

The Works of William Shakespeare Gathered into One Volume. New York: Printed for the Shakespeare Head Press and published by the Oxford University Press, 1934. Pp. xii + 1264. \$3.00. Here is a great deal for three dollars, yet this edition leaves much to be desired. The unannotated text is merely "that prepared by A. H. Bullen for the Stratford Town Edition." The glossary (eleven pages, three columns to the page) omits many important words that meant one thing to the Elizabethans and another to the modern reader. The plays are arranged in conjectural order of composition, irrespective of the historical order of the chronicle plays and the grouping by types wisely adopted by the first of all the editors. There is no list of variant readings; another lack is brief factual introductions to the several dramas. Speech tags are spelled out and centered (*e. g.*, "Prince John of Lancaster"): the effect is both uneconomical and a little precious. The type improves on that of some other single-volume editions, but its legibility is reduced by blacking through the paper. The bright blue and gold cloth cover is very attractive. The size of the type considered, the book while massive is not unwieldy.

H. S.

An Introduction to Tudor Drama. By FREDERICK S. BOAS. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1933. Pp. viii + 176. \$1.50. A serviceable outline, compact, well organized, well indexed, and pleasantly illustrated. Shakespeare is not treated; the limits are Medwall and Marlowe. The results of recent research are incorporated. H. S.

Five Pre-Shakespearean Comedies [Early Tudor Period]. Edited with an introduction by FREDERICK S. BOAS. London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1934. Pp. xviii + 344 + 16. \$.80. *Fulgens and Lucrece, The Four PP, Ralph Roister Doister, Gammer Gurton's Needle, and Supposes*, in modernized texts, with glossarial footnotes. A welcome addition to "The World's Classics" series, its rule against annotation having been wisely suspended. H. S.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE SUBJECTLESS IMPERATIVE. In a recent issue of *MLN*. Professor Kemp Malone commented on my "New Plan of English Grammar," mingling praise and blame with an ever skillful hand. I should like to discuss a bit further one point he raised—the status of such expressions as *Come here*. All communications in English may be divided into two groups: a) those of complete sentence structure; and b) those which are not complete. The first type may be illustrated by *Nations war* and *Italy fought Ethiopia*, where we have subject, verb, and if required by the verbal meaning, complement. Communications which are structurally complete may be analyzed and diagrammed by means of the traditional divisions—subject, verb, complement, modifier, connective. Communications which are not complete in their structure are less readily analyzed, and fall into more than one group or type. First, there is the communication retaining its essentials, subject and verb, but lacking some other element. Such are *She knew him (to be) honest*, *He is taller than she (is tall)*, *While (he was) reading he fell asleep*. In constructions such as these the ordinary plan is to supply the missing words and then analyze or diagram as before. Constructions lacking subject or verb or both are of a great variety of types, from the imperative such as *Come here* (where we supply *you*) and the omitted-first-person type (*Went down town today*) to the constructions such as *Yes, Hello, Just a minute*, where it is difficult or impossible to construct a full sentence convincingly, due to uncertainty about what words to supply. An example is *Boston return*, where we may supply (*You give me a*) *Boston return (ticket)*, (*I want a*) *Boston return (ticket)*, (*It is a*) *Boston return (ticket I seek)*, etc. With the particle *Hello*, no supplying of words makes convincing sense. Notice also

the very common use of the non-sentence in advertisements (*Butter 35c. lb.*) and on shop fronts (*Quick lunch*), where it is obviously impracticable to supply the missing elements to make complete sentences. It is this third group to which the ordinary sentence plan of analysis cannot be applied without difficulty, or even violence, and it is for such constructions that I have suggested the term *non-sentence*. Probably a better name might be found, but I have not been able to find it. Somewhere between *You come here* (complete sentence) and *Hello* (non-sentence) a dividing line must be drawn. While it might seem easy to include *Come here* with the sentences, this plan leads to confusion, as it is then very hard to tell just where the non-sentence does begin. On the whole I believe it preferable to use as a test the actual presence or absence of an independent subject-verb combination, thus denying to *Come here* the name of sentence. The chief reason for separating between the complete sentence and the non-sentence, apart from the fact of their difference in structure, is the fact that they fall into different classifications and require different methods of analysis. Non-sentences are not to be classified as simple, complex, and compound, nor does the declarative-interrogative grouping fit them. They are best grouped, according to extent, into word, phrase, and clause non-sentences, with possible combinations of these. According to intent they fall naturally into non-sentences of information, responses, salutations, imperatives, and several other types. The whole class or type needs further study and analysis. An interesting problem is presented by the so-called imperative-vocative construction. Is *Mary, come here* properly to be called complete or incomplete, sentence or non-sentence? Except for the punctuation, the word *Mary* conforms to the tests and definitions for the subject of a verb. It is possible though not certain that this construction might be included with complete sentences.

JANET B. AIKEN

Columbia University

THE PERSIAN QUATRAIN AGAIN. Cf. *MLN.*, XLIX, 301-2, 562. Another variant composed during the French Parnassian period is André Lemoyne's "Pensée d'un sage" (*Fleurs et ruines* in Vol. III of Lemoyne's *Poésies*, Lemerre ed.). As the verse in this volume was written between 1884 and 1890, Lemoyne's poem is posterior to those of Manuel and Ratisbonne. It reads:

Ainsi parle un ancien poète d'Orient:
 Cher enfant désiré, lorsque tu vins au monde,
 Tous riaient. Dans les cœurs la joie était profonde,
 Et toi seul tu pleurais, dans tes larmes criant.
 Vis en sorte qu'un jour, quand plus tard viendra l'heure
 Où la mort étendra son doigt sur ta demeure,
 Ton départ soit un deuil pour tous, que chacun pleure
 Lorsque toi seul en paix t'en iras souriant.

AARON SCHAFER

The University of Texas